Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-237 *10 December 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

IAEA Ready To Help With INF Verification 1
Volovets Denies USSR Developing Laser Weapon *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Dec]* 1
More From Chervov on Correlation of Forces *[Bratislava PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Leaders To Meet in Berlin 11 Dec 4
CEMA Delegations At Moscow Conference 8-9 Dec 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev To Brief Pact Ministers on Summit 5
Violation of Japanese Airspace 'Unintentional' 5
Deaths at Chernobyl Not Related to Radiation 5
USSR Approves Agreement on Commodities Fund 5
Special 'Top Priority' Views INF Treaty *[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]* 6
Petrovskiy Views Summit, Regional Issues *[AL HAWADITH 11 Dec]* 9

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT

Reagan, Gorbachev Activities, Speeches 12
3d Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting 12
Fitzwater, Gerasimov on Talks 12
PRAVDA Describes Signing *[9 Dec]* 12
More on 'Intelligentsia' 13
Shultz Hosts Luncheon 14
Shultz Toasts Gorbachev 15
Gorbachev Luncheon Speech 15
Attendees Reported 17
Gorbachev Meets With Congressmen 17
Further on Meeting 19
Congressmen Cited 19
Gorbachev Meets Media Leaders 20
Denies Split in Politburo 22
Gorbachev Hosts Embassy Dinner 22
Addresses Reagan, Guests 22
Reagan Replies 23
10 Dec Agenda Announced 24
Raisa Gorbacheva Visits Gallery 24
Bush Supports INF Treaty 25
Shevardnadze, Shultz Meet 25
Joint Statement on Verification 25
Shultz' Comments Reported 26
Carlucci on Future Prospects 26
Arbatov Comments on Treaty *[Tokyo NHK Television]* 26
Charikov on Opposition 28
Patriarch Pimen Comments 29
'New Era May Be Dawning' *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 29
New Proposals Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Dec]* 31

Memorandum, Protocols to Treaty *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 32
Treaty, Verification Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 10 Dec]* 34
Gorbachev's Popularity Noted 37
U.S. Public Interest Cited *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 37
Correction to Gorbachev Arrival Report 38

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

China

Foreign Ministry Hails Signing of INF Treaty 39
Treaty Seen To Ease Tension 39
Delegation in USSR Discusses Power Cooperation 39
USSR Seeks Better Ties in Asia-Pacific Region 40
Federov on Okinawa's Role in Pentagon Plans 40

Northeast Asia

Japanese Premier's Policy Speech Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 41
Idea of Joint U.S.-Japan Command Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec]* 41
Dmitriyev on Japan's Anti-Soviet Acts 42
Japan Rejects Proposed Science Accord With U.S. 42
Delegation Returns From Japanese CP Congress *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 43
Journal Reports Story of Japan's CW Island *[APN MILITARY BULLETIN No 22]* 43
Problems Noted in Soviet, Mongolian Trade *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* 43

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Thai Minister Receives General Ivanovskiy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Dec]* 44
Further on Hun Sen-Sihanouk Talks in Paris 44
Communique Issued 44
Cambodian Beam on Talks 44
Hun Sen Departs From Moscow 45
Sixth SRV Cambodia Troop Withdrawal Reported *[PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 45
Reaction to Troop Pullout 46
SPK Cites Thai 'Provocations' Against Cambodia 46

Near East & South Asia

Soviet Diplomat on Troop Withdrawal From DRA *[TANJUG]* 47
Daily Notes Cruelty of Afghan Rebel Leaders 47
PRAVDA Profiles Warships on Gulf Escort Duty *[V. Belyakov, 6 Dec]* 47

East Europe

SFRY Presidium Welcomes Summit Missile Treaty 48
GDR's Krentz, Norway's Foerde Hail INF Treaty 49
Polish School Receives Gorbachev Message 49

West Europe

Thatcher Reacts to Gorbachev's UK Visit 49
Holds Press Conference *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 49
Moscow TV Interview on Visit 50
Moscow TV Interview on Treaty 51
Gorbachev's Visit 'Pleasant' *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 51
Journalists 'Refuse' To Note Emigration Progress 52
Appeal for Frenchman Detained in DRA Attacked *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 53
Gorbachev Congratulates French CP Leader *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 54
Soviet, EC Parliamentarians Meet in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 54

Latin America & Caribbean

Plane Violating Nicaraguan Airspace Shot Down 54
Pilot Linked to CIA, Contras *[Chigir]* 55
Reporters Link AID to CIA in Latin America 55

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

High-Level Corruption Implied in Bribes *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 2 Dec]* 56
'No Grounds for Complacency' on Drink *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 62
Customs Buys Sophisticated Foreign Equipment *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 65
Kiev Oblast Party Meetings Criticized *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 65
'Pseudopacifist' Group's Anti-Sovietism *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Dec]* 66
Spotlight on Ufa's Serious Pollution Problem *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Dec]* 67
Rostov Lacks 'Politically Literate' Cadres *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 70
Medvedev Gives Speech to GOSR Conference *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 72
Theatrical Play on Chernobyl Banned in Moscow *[TANJUG]* 75
Solovyev Sees 'No Alternative' to Restructuring *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 75
Listeners' Opinions on Restructuring 78
Historian Cited on Trotskiy Reappraisal *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 5 Dec]* 78
Komsomol Plenum Views Progress, Expels Miscreants *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Dec]* .. 80
Demichev Addresses Fergana, Ashkhabad Aktivs *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 81

Economic

MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA Zaykov 27 Nov Report *[28 Nov]* 84

Scientific

New Space Crews Presented to Journalists 90
Lapshin Interviewed on Nuclear Safety *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 90

IAEA Ready To Help With INF Verification

LD091715 Moscow TASS in English 164 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Vienna December 9 TASS—The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) would be ready, given the consent to this of the Soviet Union and the United States, "to provide assistance in the implementation of the verification measures" envisaged by the treaty on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range missiles, the IAEA Director General Hans Blix said today in an interview to an Austrian radio station.

Volovets Denies USSR Developing Laser Weapon

PM091211 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87 First Edition p 3

[S. Volovets "Rejoinder": "The Pentagon's Second SDI"]

[Text] We are already aware that different people have prepared in different ways for the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan. In one of its special commentaries the Voice of America just recently informed the world of a Pentagon report. This report claims (for the umpteenth time) that the Soviet Union has created its own version of SDI. But wait: This is not all. According to the Pentagon, "the Soviet laser program is more extensive than the U.S. program." The Pentagon is even prepared to confess. Despite the billions of dollars it has spent to date, it admits, "most of what is known to the United States about directed energy weapons is based on the results of Soviet research published in the sixties and seventies."

Not bad. This means that it has taken the U.S. Defense Department 4 years of research and study and enormous amounts of money to verify publications in Soviet scientific journals 10-20 years ago.

Joking aside, the reasoning behind this Pentagon report and its popularization by VOA is as clear as day. It is only a few days since M.S. Gorbachev explained in an interview with the U.S. national television company NBC that the Soviet Union is, of course, engaged in fundamental scientific research in areas contiguous with those covered by SDI research. The difference is that we are not developing and do not intend to develop weapons systems like those envisaged by SDI.

Yes, it is indeed true that Soviet Academicians Basov and Prokhorov were the pioneers of laser technology. We have never made a secret of this. But as far as opponents of the Soviet-U.S. meeting are concerned, anything goes in their effort to cast a shadow on this meeting.

More From Chervov on Correlation of Forces

AU101004 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 8 Dec 87 p 6

[Interview with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by NOVOSTI Military Commentator V. Morozov: "The Untenability of the False Thesis on the So-Called Soviet Superiority in Conventional Weapons; Asymmetry Does Not Have To Mean Advantage or Disadvantage"—place and date not given]

[Text] When it became clear that the meeting of the USSR and U.S. highest representatives would take place in Washington and an agreement on the elimination of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles would be signed, the proponents of the feverish arms buildup and opponents of the reduction of tension intensified a propaganda campaign against this process. They wanted to exploit the old-new problem of the USSR's so-called superiority in conventional weapons in Europe to torpedo disarmament agreements.

In an interview with NOVOSTI Military Commentator V. Morozov, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, speaks about the untenability of the Western propaganda's thesis on the USSR's "superiority" over the United States in conventional weapons.

[Morozov] There is much talk in the West about the "Soviet Union's immense superiority in conventional weapons," and they always make use of this false thesis when any agreements on disarmament are on the horizon. What can be said about that?

[Chervov] NATO experts have been avoiding making a profound analysis of the real potential of the two sides' armed forces and an assessment of this problem by comparing the military potentials as a whole, and not selectively, according to individual weapons' components.

The armed forces of the two sides consist, as is known, of three main components—the navies, the air forces, and the ground forces. The U.S. Navy has a distinct superiority over the USSR Navy in all respects. Authoritative data attest to the fact that regarding large vessels (battleships, cruisers, torpedo boats, and guided-missile frigates), the United States has 2.5-fold superiority, in aircraft carriers an absolute superiority (the United States has 20 of these ships, of which 15 are attack aircraft carriers; the USSR has none), it has 2.5 times more navy aircraft, and 16 times more marines. Regarding the total tonnage of battle and auxiliary vessels, the United States has 16 times more. The superiority of the NATO naval forces over the Warsaw Pact naval forces is clear, even without the intention of the United States to increase the number of its ships to 600 units, which will enable it to deploy thousands of cruise missiles on ships in the vicinity of the USSR. In a letter to the U.S.

Congress on 28 January this year, R. Reagan openly stated: "Our naval superiority makes it possible for us to exploit the geographical vulnerability of the Soviet Union and effect a permanent threat to Soviet interests."

Here the question naturally arises why the United States and NATO are not calling for the elimination of the "lack of balance" and "asymmetry" in naval strength. Disarmament has been discussed for 20 years now, and during that entire period the United States and NATO have not even consented to a more serious assessment of the problem of limiting naval forces and air forces. What is involved here? Why is the stress being put on ground forces only? I am convinced that this line aims at the United States and NATO preserving the strongest components of their armed forces—the naval forces and air forces.

[Morozov] What is the real picture regarding the mutual correlation of strength in ground forces?

[Chervov] Can one speak about some sort of "Warsaw Pact and USSR superiority" when the Western statistics do not take into account the French and Spanish Armed Forces (1 million men, 20 divisions)?

Why do they not also count the armed forces under national command, for example those of Great Britain and other countries? Why are the Western powers' reserve formations, their stockpiled weapons, and technology not considered? The data on NATO armed forces are being constantly and deliberately underrated, but the data on the Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact and the USSR overrated. In particular, the construction troops, border troops, security forces, and members of the DOSAAF are counted. The result is an incorrect picture of the correlation of forces.

The facts show that at present armies that are more than 3-million-men-strong are facing one another in Europe. Their combat potentials are just about equal. It is obvious that an absolute symmetry between armed forces does not exist and, for all practical purposes, even cannot exist. U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz has said about this: "Even if they are saying that in a non-nuclear world they will have superiority over us in forces of general orientation, I simply do not believe it." The London Institute For Strategic Studies affirms: "The general equilibrium of strength in conventional weapons is such that...not one side has a sufficient total strength at its disposal which would guarantee it victory." This, after all, is the main criterion with which to assess the mutual correlation of forces between the NATO and Warsaw Pact.

[Morozov] What is the real picture of the mutual correlation of forces?

[Chervov] In December 1968, P. Nitze, special adviser to the U.S. secretary of state, announced in a report to U.S. Congress: "The number of troops in NATO countries is about the same as on the side of the Warsaw Pact." French Admiral Sanguinetti declared: "The West European conventional armies are numerically much stronger than the corresponding forces of the Warsaw Pact in Europe."

Regarding the number of divisions in combat readiness, NATO has considerably more of them. In view of the 60 individual brigades in combat readiness, the ratio here is 1:1.2 (78:94) to NATO's advantage. Whereas a U.S. division has 16-19,000 members and a FRG division 24,000, a Warsaw Pact division has a maximum of 11-12,000 members.

The Warsaw Pact countries have a few more tanks. Regarding offensive tactical air forces, NATO has more than 1,000 aircraft more and twice as many combat helicopters.

The overall picture then looks as follows: NATO and the Warsaw Pact have approximately the same number of troops and the same number of field artillery pieces. The Warsaw Pact has superiority in tanks, NATO in the number of combat-ready divisions and bombers. On the whole, and I am stressing it again, there is clearly an approximate parity in conventional weapons.

[Morozov] The question arises—what is the situation with the imbalance and asymmetry?

[Chervov] We are willing to assess ways to eliminate imbalance, be it on a bilateral basis with the United States, or on the level of alliances, but in such a way as not to upset the overall correlation of forces, which is currently approximately equal. We are willing to agree to a bilateral elimination of asymmetry. However, not by increasing, but by reducing the volume of armament of the one who has gotten ahead.

There are those in the West who say that the "imbalance" in the sphere of conventional weapons could, allegedly, get even worse after the conclusion of the treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. But not even Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Committee of U.S. Chiefs of Staffs, agrees with that. He declared that an agreement on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles "will not upset the overall balance of forces in Europe; on the contrary, it could even lead to its improvement." After this the question crops up what is the objective of the latest "military augmentation," planned by NATO.

[Morozov] Thus it is possible to say that the number of the NATO and Warsaw Pact armed forces and conventional weapons makes it possible—on an equal basis and without impairing mutual security—to proceed with reducing military counterweight in Europe. How can this be done?

[Chervov] I would like to recall that the following is being proposed in connection with the Warsaw Pact's Budapest Appeal: an initial one-time reduction within 1-2 years, a reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact troops by 100-150,000 men on each side, and at the beginning of the 1990's a reduction of the ground forces and the tactical offensive air forces of the two military alliances in Europe by one-fourth (more than 1,000,000 men altogether) compared with the present level. What is further being planned is a reduction of conventional weapons by all European countries, the United States, and Canada. As for the sequence, the manner of reduction, and the questions of verification, they are explained in detail in the Budapest program.

[Morozov] What are the prospects for future talks?

[Chervov] If we orient ourselves according to the Vienna talks, which have been going on for 14 years now, then they are very gloomy. But if we consider the situation at the Vienna meeting of the 35 CSCE participating states, there is the hope that a mandate will be agreed for new all-European talks, because both sides are interested in them. It is characteristic that the issue of the reduction of armed forces, tactical nuclear and conventional weapons, for a long time was only secondary in disarmament talks, is coming to the forefront of that process now.

If the Vienna meeting adopts a mandate this year, the Europe-wide talks could begin in the first half of 1988. These will be complex and difficult talks.

My view is as follows: The important thing, above all, is that countries agree on the volume and contents of the starting [vychodiskove] numerical data (general and individual for each component of the talks). Precisely in this lies the danger of a "discussion about figures," which will have to be overcome at the beginning of the talks. This is not an easy task but, both sides willing, it can be resolved.

In my view, various scenarios are possible: 1. For example, begin by ascertaining "imbalances" on both sides and then agreeing on their elimination by reducing the armaments of the one that has superiority. 2. Begin directly with an equal percentage reduction (volumes and stages according to an agreement). 3. Agree on any reduced level of the two sides' armed forces which is necessary for defense, but unsuitable for attack. From a coordinated "defensive minimum" one could go over to the necessary reductions. However, in that case it would not be responsible to talk only about ground forces and leave out the navies and air forces. Of course, other options are also possible.

With every approach, the most important thing is not to upset the overall balance and to maintain equal security. Therefore it would be an illusion to expect one side to reduce its armament and the other side just to verify it.

The Soviet Union is convinced that the process of armament reduction must be continuous so that ultimately the military-technical possibility of one country being attacked by another is ruled out. In such a process leaps are unacceptable, just as it is unacceptable when reducing one kind of weapons to feverishly arm in other respects.

There is no doubt that the success of new talks would be helped by confidence-building measures, especially by resolving an important problem causing concern to European nations, such as limiting the risk of a sudden attack.

To this end we propose the following concrete measures: the reduction of the concentration of armed forces and armament to the minimal agreed level in the zone of contact between the two military blocs; the removal from this zone of the most dangerous types of weapons; the establishment of a 300-km wide (150 km on each side) nuclear-free corridor along the line of contact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, from which all nuclear weapons would be removed on a bilateral basis; the establishment in Europe of zones without nuclear and chemical weapons; zones with a reduced concentration of armaments and increased trust; a comparison of military doctrines and assessment of "imbalances" on the level of experts.

We are impatiently waiting for NATO to explain to us its standpoint on these proposals to us.

[Morozov] Adhering to its defensive doctrine, the USSR has been building its armed forces on the principle of adequacy for defense. What does it mean?

[Chervov] In the current stage it is enough for strategic nuclear forces to conform to the ability not to permit an unpunished nuclear attack on our country, even in the most unfavorable situation.

With conventional weapons one takes into account the size and the quality of armed forces sufficient to ensure the country's reliable defense.

The extent of the adequacy for defense is determined by the U.S. and NATO activities. The Soviet Union is not striving to achieve military superiority, it does not lay claim to greater security, but will also not accede to lesser security, and will not permit military superiority over itself. We do not want to compete with the West in the development of specific types of weapons. We choose measures that guarantee the security of the Soviet Union and its allies.

Warsaw Pact Leaders To Meet in Berlin 11 Dec
LD091658 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—In accordance with a mutual arrangement, a meeting of leaders of the Warsaw-Treaty countries will be held in Berlin on December 11, 1987.

CEMA Delegations At Moscow Conference 8-9 Dec
LD092258 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—A special meeting of the conference of heads of agencies dealing with inventions in the CMEA member countries was held in Msocow on December 8-9. It was attended by delegations of agencies of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia.

The conference centred on issues pertaining to multilateral cooperation of agencies dealing with inventions of the CMEA member countries under the conditions of restructuring the mechanism of cooperation of CMEA member countries and CMEA activities. Delegations approved proposals on priority areas of multilateral cooperation.

They examined and approved the report of the conference on the work done in 1987.

The meeting of the conference was held in an atmosphere of friendship, mutual understanding and constructive comradely cooperation.

Gorbachev To Brief Pact Ministers on Summit
LD101313 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 10 TASS—Leading figures from the Warsaw Treaty member nations are, by mutual agreement, to meet in Berlin, capital of the German Democratic Republic, tomorrow and a Soviet foreign ministry spokesman said the meeting would focus on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

The spokesman, Yuriy Gremitshikh, first deputy chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, told a TASS diplomatic correspondent today: "The meeting is expected to discuss first of all the results of the Soviet-American talks at summit level. A report on them will be given by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee."

Violation of Japanese Airspace 'Unintentional'
LD101345 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 10 TASS—On December 9, 1987 a Soviet plane unintentionally violated Japan's air space twice in the region of the island of Okinawa. This occurred because of the failure of the navigational system of the aircraft on a flight in complicated weather conditions, Yuriy Gremetskikh, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., said at today's briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

The Soviet side is expressing its regret at what happened. Measures will be taken to preclude such occurrences.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman said that the same information would be conveyed to the Japanese side through diplomatic channels.

Deaths at Chernobyl Not Related to Radiation
LD101159 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] A fuss has once again been raised recently in the West. Rumors and conjectures are being spread alleging a bad radiation situation at the Chernobyl AES. A publication in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA on 4 December is being used as grounds for this fuss.

At a press conference for Soviet and Foreign journalists held in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center, Yuriy Nikolayevich Filimontsev, member of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power, talked to journalists:

[Begin Filimontsev recording] Since the publication in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA on 4 December of material containing excerpts from a speech made at a party conference by Comrade Lukyanenko, first secretary of the Slavutich party committee, Western media have been circulating reports about a supposedly bad state of affairs concerning the radiation situation at the Chernobyl AES.

In connection with this, competent Soviet organizations officially state that on the territory of the Chernobyl AES over the last 10 months not a single accident has occured connected with radiation. Five cases of general injury were registered. At the station itself, at its power units, the level of staff exposure to radiation during this period was four times lower than is permitted under operating norms. The fact that the USSR Ministry of Health allowed teams operating in shifts to settle on a duty basis in the town of Pripyat is also testimony to the favorable radiation situation at the station and surrounding areas.

As far as the 36 incidents are concerned, including the three that resulted in death, which were mentioned in Comrade Lukyanenko's speech, none has any direct bearing whatsoever on work at the station, and are in no way connected with the irradiation of people. Two deaths resulted from faults in constructing a house in the town of Slavutich and the third person died by drowning in the Dnepr.

Western Media are purposely distorting not only the material published in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, but also the situation itself at Chernobyl. All of this is testimony to the unscrupulous nature of Western Propaganda. [end recording]

USSR Approves Agreement on Commodities Fund
LD101003 Moscow TASS in English 0430 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 10 TASS—A document on the acceptance by the USSR of the agreement on the institution of a common fund for commodities has been handed over to the United Nations secretary-general. This completed the legal procedure formalising the USSR's participation in this agreement, and created prerequisites for the agreement to enter into force as soon as possible.

"The Soviet Union consistently comes out in favour of elaboration and practical realisation of a concept of international economic security and restructuring of international economic relations on a fair and democratic basis", Viktor Zvezdin, deputy permanent representative of the USSR, said at a press conference at the U N. headquarters today.

"An important component of this process is to harmonise such a major sector of world trade as trade in commodities".

The agreement provides for a wide range of measures to give greater scope to intergovernmental cooperation on the world markets of mineral raw materials, non-ferrous

metals, farm products and food through the establishment of a common fund—a financial basis of international commodity agreements. Effective implementation of the agreement on the common fund for commodities will promote the development of mutually-beneficial international trade, and will become a practical contribution to the establishment of a democratic stable trading system ensuring economic security of all countries.

"Participating in the agreement on the common fund for commodities, the Soviet Union proceeded, first of all, from the assumption that the common fund's future activities are a vital necessity for the developing countries, since depending on the expansion of the manufacture and export of commodities is to a decisive extent their ability to solve the basic problems of social and economic development and, first of all, the problem of foreign debt".

"At the same time a stable and predictable functioning of main commodity markets is also essential for harmonious development of the world economy as a whole. It seems that monetary upheavals of the recent period are yet another call to the entire international community to pool efforts with a view to working out effective means in this direction".

"The USSR's accession to the agreement on the institution of a common fund for commodities is yet another confirmation that the new political thinking, which the Soviet leadership calls for and which is based on the priority of values common to mankind and on the recognition of the growing interdependence of the contemporary world—is being embodied in specified practical actions", the Soviet representative emphasized.

"It is hoped in the USSR that the acceptance of the agreement by the Soviet Union will make it possible to put it into effect soon".

Special 'Top Priority' Views INF Treaty

LD092127 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 9 Dec 87

["Top Priority" program with Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to a special edition of "Top Priority," with Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. The 8 December saw a truly historic event as General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan signed an INF Treaty, eliminating two classes of nuclear missiles—intermediate- and shorter-range—both in Europe and in Asia. What makes the INF Treaty in my view so historic, so outstanding, is that we have finally moved from arms control, with its emphasis on numerical ceilings and limits, to arms reductions, that is, disarmament.

[Bogdanov] To arms destruction, rather.

[Kuznetsov] Well, destruction, reduction, disarmament. Well, I accept that, but I also realize that it will take some time for us to grasp all the treaty's provisions, fine points, to analyze them, to study them carefully, and also to see whether this treaty is smoothly implemented or not. In the meantime, I would like you to answer the following question: What are the first lessons that we are to derive from this INF Treaty, from this truly outstanding, unprecedented event? Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Pavel...

[Kuznetsov] Yes, please.

[Bogdanov] I'm pretty much emotional, but beleive me, this time my emotions are overwhelming because as a professional I am full of thoughts, full of emotions, and my first question is why all that became possible...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Yes, that's right.

[Bogdanov] Why all that happened?

[Kuznetsov] That's a good question.

[Bogdanov] Why for 40 years we were not able to acheive some major results, but within 3 years we have achieved some outstanding, unbelievable results, and I am not exaggerating; they are unbelievable. So I am trying to answer that question myself. And my first answer, I don't know whether Sergey will agree with me or not, but my first answer is that the ground for that is the new thinking. A new thinking, because we have found in ourselves enough strength, enough spirit, enough, you know, common sense to come out of the vicious circle of calcaulating figures—you have mentioned that—of calculating figures, of taking into account this cold iron thing which has no soul in it. We found the common sense, you know, to say to each other: Guys, please stop over, we are moving toward the brink. Let's come down to earth, and let's talk business; let's talk sense. And when both sides started to talk sense to each other, they reached an agreement. That's my very simple answer and very human answer.

[Kuznetsov] As a follow-up question to what Professor Bogdanov has just said: What was the psychological trigger that made both sides moving all of a sudden, because Professor Bogdanov was talking about years of inaction and all of a sudden both sides began to move toward each other. What was the psychological trigger?

[Plekhanov] I would agree that the factor of new thinking was especially important. There is another, purely psychological factor: The specifics of the two personalities, who were better able than others to rise above the political differences and to emphasize the general human interest.

[Kuznetsov] You mean the right men at the right time, in the right place?

[Plekhanov] Yes, yes.

[Bogdanov] The right man in the White House and the right man in the Kremlin—let me put it that way. I'm sorry, interrupting you.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, yeah, but I would like to add to this analysis a couple of other things. I think that the possibility of finally ending the cold war—and this is what we are faced with—I think there is a real possibility of drawing a line after decades of the cold war because the detente of the 1970's was an attempt to go away from the cold war, but it was too much weighted with many of the precepts of the cold war and, as a rule, there was a regression back to the cold war maxims in the 1980's. Now I think that there are two very important factors which have made cold war finally redundant: No. One—In the 1980's, the United States had tried to reassert its role as the global power, which is willing and able to assert its will around the globe and it has failed in that attempt. And Ronald Reagan has emerged as the last of the Mohicans, if you will, of the cold war thinking and he, at the same time, has turned out to be a leader who is beginning to recognize that a new kind of approach is necessary for U.S. foreign policy.

[Kuznetsov] (?Alright), excuse me. I think that some of them are still left in the United States Congress.

[Plekhanov] Oh yes, well of course, there is a lot of inertia, of old cold war thinking.

[Bogdanov] And of course, we should not ever forget that we have to deal with a very complex political system, with a very complex society.

[Plekhanov] Oh yes, Multi....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Multi: Multiseat, multicenter society.

[Kuznetsov] Excuse me. Wading through numerous reports on the summit and its implications for the political sitaution, I've come across very curious observations by an American journalist and it sort of interreacts with what you've been saying Professor Plekhanov, and it is... [changes thought] this journalist said that it is upsetting to see the end of the cold war, not because we liked it or were happy about it...

[?Plekhanov, interrupting] But because we are used ot it.

[Kuz netsov] Yeah, used to it. And now we are on the verge of taking a giant step or a leap into something unknown, and this is what makes so many people both jubilant and triumphant, and at the same time ill at ease. Would you agree with ...? [fails to complete thought]

[Plekhanov] Yeah, I think that there is an understandable wariness on behalf of some people, but the majority I think, including the majority in the political circles in the United States and in the West, are viewing this leap positively because you know, the old thinking is like shackles on everybody's feet.

[Kuznetsov] Right.

[Plekhanov] There are too many vicious circles out of which we haven't been able to find a way. I would also like to say about the second factor. I said two factors. One is the cold war on the American side. The other is a change inside the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is changing radically. It has entered a new stage of its development, a new stage of maturity. And that is reflected in its approach both to its domestic problems and to the foreign policy, to the issues of international politics. We are able to approach those problems on a broader and longer-term basis.

[Bogdanov] And in that there is a very close link, I believe, between our domestic and foreign policy.

[Plekhanov] Oh yes!

[Bogdanov] I believe that Gorbachev's visit and the (?results) would not be possible without our domestic changes.

[Plekhanov] I agree with that.

[Bogdanov] The domestic changes are roots, real roots of our foreign policy, reasonableness of, commonsense foreign policy. [sentence as heard]

[Kuznetsov] I am not a scholar; I am a journalist, so please correct me if I am wrong, but I think that the Reagan administration has presented us with a unique opportunity to gain invaluable experience with dealing with the very conservative segments of the American political life, and, well, in that sense the Reagan administration has been a help to us in getting more mature in, well, departing with (?perhaps some of our) former illusions, illusions of the past, of growing up in the sense that we became an equal partner, able to listen to the other side and perhaps even accept some of the criticism that was aimed at us. Would you agree with this?

[Plekhanov] Well, I feel dubious about that. It is a little like, you know, thanking somebody who has been starting fires for the improvement of the work of the fire brigade because in the first Reagan administration the situation in the world had deteriorated radically and (?thus) the challenge from the United States became much more dangerous. And of course, that I think was an impetus, even if a negative one, toward change in our policy. We had to rise up to the challenge. In that sense, of course, Reagan was a help in bringing out the best in us, but in a negative way. [chuckles] But you see the most important thing is that within the United States there are changes. A more mature view is emerging. Would you agree with that, Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Yes, I would agree with that, but I have a feeling, pretty deep down feeling, that in some way we might have overreacted to the first Reagan administration.

[Kuznetsov] You mean to the first years of the Reagan...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] The 4 first years of the Reagan administration. And my feeling is that what the President was doing it was rather meant for the American domestic audience [chuckles] than for us.

[Kuznetsov] Oh yes, that was a major...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] That's my feeling. Now if you look back, and if you analyze all that, if you look at all that from today's point of view, you may come to some very interesting conclusions, and I hope, Pavel, that one day you will invite us to discuss that point. What happened to America, what happened to this president?

[Kuznetsov] Right, Right, let's...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I believe it is pretty, pretty interesting, interesting (factor)...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Let's go back to the INF Treaty. I think what makes it especially outstanding is that at no time in the past has any other accord provided us with so sweeping, so stringent, and so intrusive verification procedures. For example, well, each side is entitled to 20 surprise on-site inspections a year. Each side will be controlled as to how it goes about eliminating those weapons. One of the ways of doing so, as far as I know at this moment, is that each side is allowed 100 launchings of unarmed missiles to burn their fuel. Other ways include destroying them by blowtorch or by furnace, and so on and so forth. Now, we know that the period, the inspection period, is going to cover a span of 13 years, and teams of inspectors will be virtually residing in each other's countries, as President Reagan put it. Now, what has made this possible? I mean verification and control have always been a point of discord between the two countries.

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I feel I look like looking at that from rather philosophical point of view than technical point of view, and answering your question why, my only answer is that the Soviet society is becoming open society, more open society, generally open society; a society which is sure of itself, will always (?be). We never had problems with verification. We had problems with one thing, with the linkage between volume of arms control measures and verification, and we were always telling our American counterparts: Guys, verification and control are strictly dependent on the volume of arms control measures. If we have something on the table as arms control...

[?Plekhanov, interrupting] Or reduction.

[Bogdanov] Or reduction, you have verification, you have control. And (?behind that) we were up to our....

[?Plekhanov, interrupting] We didn't want verification to become a means of spying, that's what you're talking about.

[Bogdanov] No, I mean that if you have very serious...

[?Plekhanov, interrupting] To verify...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] If you have a very serious agreement which is of great concern to both powers...

[?Plekhanov, interrupting] It has to be controlled.

[Bogdanov] It has to be controlled because the other side, if you have all that on the table, is (?a lot) less interested.

[Kuznetsov] The signing of the INF Treaty was greeted with loud cheers and applause throughout the world, and we know that there are more friends in this world of this accord than there are enemies, but still there are opponents of this treaty, and we've just got a tape from Washington D.C., and on this tape you will hear what I think are the widespread views of the opposition, and they were expressed by a (Gene Kellor), recorded by our reporter, Mikhail Taratuta.

[Begin (Kellor) recording] I think that what the summit equals is basically a sell-out of Western Europe by President Reagan to sort [as heard] the Soviet political control. The problem is not armaments; the question is that the Soviets at this point, under the leadership of Nikolay Ogarkov, are conducting experiments apart from the SDI, which Mr Gorbachev himself admitted that the Soviet were conducting an SDI program. They are also working in the area of radio frequency weapons. Therefore, the elimination of nuclear weapons has not (?by) one iota lowered the level of conflict. But that a situation in which the West were defenseless, as it would be if the overall Soviet conventional superiority in the European theatre [as heard] then this, (?it just) pushes us closer to war because it creates a greater discrepency between the two sides in the European theatre. But if the INF Treaty goes through, I think we're closer to World War III than ever before. [end recording]

[Kuznetsov] Now, what do you think about what this guy has just said? He is critical both of President Reagan, Marshal Ogarkov, and of General Secretary Gorbachev.

[Plekhanov] I'm reminded of a famous book by a great American historian, Richard Hofstadter, who wrote about the paranoid style in American politics. And America has more than its share of political paranoids. A lot of people live off paranoia, but this (Kellar) seems to really believe in what he said, but that only shows that he doesn't know what he's talking about. I wonder if that saves him morally; I mean, if you don't know that you are saying lies, you're sure that it is the truth.

[Bogdanov] My reaction to that is a little bit different than my friend Sergey. My reaction is that if you have something substantial, something very important, something major, you ought to have ideas of that, otherwise, if you haven't had any, it is not fair. And believe me, Pavel, but if you asked somebody at Moscow street, you may possibly get the same answer criticizing that we've got this agreement with the Americans. I would not dramatize that; I would (?look) to take it on its own merit.

[Kuznetsov] I fully agree with those who say that the INF Treaty alone would be a modest step if it is not followed by further steps, one of them being 50 percent cuts in long-range or the strategic offensive arms, and I think we'll discuss that in our regular edition of "Top Priority" on Friday. In the meantime, I'd like to ask you this question: What do you think? Is this INF Treaty going to be ratified or is it going to be crippled by the so-called killer amendments linking the treaty with conventional arms cuts and human rights, even regional conflicts? There are about 20 senators (?who are not long in the Senate) opposing this treaty. What do you think about that?

[Plekhanov] Well, it's an open question because there will be a battle in the U.S. Senate and around Washington on this issue and a lot of people will be trying to cripple the treaty, but I am hopeful that, that it will be ratified without being crippled in the process.

[Bogdanov] Would you like to have a bet with me, Pavel?

[Kuznetsov] A bet with you? No, no, no.

[Bogdanov] No? Mine is it will be ratified.

[Kuznetsov] Ratified; I'll be with you, I'm not going to bet against it. What about you, Sergey?

[Plekhanov] Well, I've just said I hope it will be ratified...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] You are more cautious. [laughter]

[Plekhanov] No, No I would be prepared to bet.

[Kuznetsov] You know, there is one snag. Will it be ratified in time for President Reagan to come to Moscow with something more substantial on this, you know, eh, I mean next year, in the first half of next year. That's one of the problems.

[Bogdanov] My answer's positive.

[Kuz entsov] Positive? You mean that it will be ratified in time?

[Bogdanov] Yes.

[Kuznetsov] Alright, we've started with...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] But at the same, you know, we should listen what Sergey says because he is supposed to be the best expert on American domestic politics.... [brief passage indistinct due to crosstalk]

[Plekhanov] I say I'm hopeful that it will be ratified, that if there is enough political will on the side of the Reagan administration and the moderate (?forces)...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] We are running out of time.

[Bogdanov] I don't like his, his... [changes thought] I'm sorry, Pavel.

[Kuznetsov] OK, gentlemen, we are running out of time. We started this program with an emotional opening from Prof Bogdanov, who said he is overwhelmed. What would be your parting commentary, parting comments, before we round up this program? What are your feelings, your mood? Are you in the grips of euphoria, fever, or are you, eh...

[Plekhanov] My mood is right-on, fellows, right-on.

[Kuznetsov] Right-on. Prof Bogdanov? Apart from being overwhelmed.

[Bogdanov] For the first time in so many years, Americans and me, we've got a very excellent Christmas present.

Petrovskiy Views Summit, Regional Issues

PM101141 London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 11 Dec 87 pp 35, 36

[Interview with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Valdimir Petrovskiy by Raghidah Dirgham in New York; date not specified]

[Excerpts] [Introductory passage omitted] AL-HAWADITH:After the initial agreement between the U.S. secretary of state and the Soviet foreign minister on the agreement concerning the elimination of medium-range nuclear missiles, do you share the concern raised by some U.S. circles that the Senate will obstruct ratification of this agreement?

Petrovskiy: That is a U.S. internal matter. However, any state that enters as a party into an agreement is supposed to be capable of implementing it. This applies to any state under international conventions.

AL-HAWADITH: Many consider this agreement to be the beginning of further agreements on disarmament. So what doors will it open?

Petrovskiy: I believe that it will open a very important door, since people have been talking about complete nuclear disarmament for a long time. Practically this agreement actually means the elimination of two types of nuclear weapons, medium-range and short-range. This is

happening for the first time in history. This agreement will boost the idea of nuclear disarmament. In our view it is a significant link in the nuclear disarmament chain. Upon or immediately after the signing of the agreement we intend to issue instructions to our delegations in Geneva to begin drafting an agreement for a 50% reduction in strategic offensive weapons, with full commitment to the ABM treaty, which banned the testing or deployment of any new antimissile weapons. We believe that such an agreement can be reached during the next Soviet-U.S. summit, in addition to an agreement on questions relating to chemical weapons. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: President Reagan has recently been reiterating that the Soviet Union has made huge advances in the strategic defense field known as "Star Wars," and that the Soviet side is seeking to obstruct the U.S. program while pursuing a very advanced program of its own. What is your reply?

Petrovskiy: Authoritatively I can confirm to you that the Soviet Union has not taken any measures beyond the limits provided for under the ABM treaty. All that we have achieved falls within the framework of this treaty.

AL-HAWADITH: But you are not challenging what President Reagan has said, namely that the Soviet Union possesses an advanced space defense program and that the Soviets' objective is to hamper the U.S. Star Wars program so that it will not compete with the Soviet Star Wars program.

Petrovskiy: We challenge this information, since we consider that our research falls within the framework of the treaty in question. We have not embarked on anything that violates its stipulations. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: Let us return to the Washington summit, which is expected to be dominated by issues relating to arms reduction. What share will regional issues have at this summit?

Petrovskiy: Of course issues relating to arms reduction will be of special importance among other important issues to be discussed. Anyhow, other issues will also be discussed. We now firmly support the idea that international security requires not only that we deal with questions relating to disarmament but also that we find effective and constructive ways of handling, managing, and even preventing crises. It also requires that economic relations be developed and human rights be dealt with. This is a new approach we are pursuing. We are here to seriously discuss any other issues, but of course the issue of nuclear arms is one of the summit's most important elements.

AL-HAWADITH: Will the Afghan problem be among regional issues?

Petrovskiy: The question of Afghanistan is one of the important issues. But there are other important issues: The Middle East, the Iraq-Iran war, and Central America. The time has come to find political solutions to all regional problems. For instance, the time has come to find a political solution to the Namibian question.

AL-HAWADITH: Some people expect the Afghan question on one hand and the Iraq-Iran war and the Gulf crisis on the other to enter into the U.S.-Soviet bargaining formula. What is your comment?

Petrovskiy: Let me frankly tell you that on the basis of our new approach it is impossible to bargain. We are absolutely against bargaining or linking one issue with another. We say that each question should be settled individually according to its requirements. We also consider the Gulf issue and the Iraq-Iran war question to be of special importance. We attach great importance to the continuation of unanimity displayed by the Security Council's five permanent member states when the region's crisis was under discussion. Of course, we are extremely concerned that a speedy solution to the Iraq-Iran war should be achieved and military escalation in the Gulf halted.

AL-HAWADITH: What Soviet ideas will be presented at the Washington summit regarding the Gulf crisis and the Iraq-Iran war?

Petrovskiy: Our new approach makes our objectives known. Talks on this question at the Washington summit will be in line with what I have repeatedly said at the United Nations. We want Resolution 598 to be implemented in full. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: You must have seen the resolutions adopted by the Amman Arab summit. These resolutions stressed, first, the need to implement Resolution 598 in its normal sequence; and second, the summit did not demand the withdrawal of foreign fleets from Gulf waters. Whereas the Soviet Union does not call for the resolution to be implemented according to the sequence of its stipulations. The Soviet position also calls for the withdrawal of all fleets from the Gulf. So how would you assess the Arab resolution and their differences with the Soviet position?

Petrovskiy: We take into consideration and completely respect the position adopted by the Arab states. But we have our own opinion of the situation. We always try to explain our concern about the continuation of the fleets' presence in the Gulf. We fear that such a military presence could lead to unexpected developments. We understand reality; that is why we are making these proposals. As for our policy on the Gulf, it is dictated by the need to secure a speedy end to the Iraq-Iran war. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: Does the Soviet position still insist on the need to give Iran more time before moving to the sanctions stage?

Petrovskiy: I cannot answer this question at this stage, since this stage is witnessing developments in the diplomatic process. Furthermore, it is of extreme importance that both parties should have a role to play in the kind of process now being carried out by the UN secretary general. We must remember that a few months ago no one would have imagined it possible to begin a normal diplomatic process. The truth is that a solution cannot be reached if one of the two parties is excluded. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: Where does the Arab-Israeli conflict fit in among regional issues to be raised at the summit?

Petrovskiy: The Middle East problem will be one of the important regional issues to be discussed at the summit.

AL-HAWADITH: When U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz visited Moscow he carried with him some ideas on the Middle East problem, but he received no Soviet response. Does the Soviet Union intend to present any ideas or proposals at the summit?

Petrovskiy: Our proposals regarding the Middle East are known. Since you have already mentioned the Amman summit, I would like to say that the Amman resolutions on the international conference on the Middle East are, in our view, very encouraging. Amman resolutions have strengthened our belief that there is only one way of finding a political settlement to the Middle East problem. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: Do you have any fear of the possibility that the summit could be a failure? And what will you consider as success or failure for the Gorbachev-Reagan summit?

Petrovskiy: The results of talks held between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz have enhanced the belief that practical and positive results can be expected from the Washington summit. One important thing is that the summit will encourage the process of negotiation and agreement on disarmament. The agreement on the elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons will also constitute a base from which further agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States would be launched. In today's world, this is important in the field of securing solutions to other questions. I have no fear, since I believe in logic. [passage omitted]

Reagan, Gorbachev Activities, Speeches

3d Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting

LD091706 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—A meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan of the United States began in the Oval Room of the White House today.

The Soviet leader arrived in Washington on an official visit on Monday and has already had two rounds of talks with the American President.

Fitzwater, Gerasimov on Talks

LD100023 Moscow TASS in English 0009 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 10 TASS—Marlin Fitzwater, assistant to the President for press relations, has described the third meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States on Wednesday "as very productive, certainly in terms of defining potential areas of agreement between the two leaders".

He said at a regular briefing that the meeting in the Oval Office of the White House continued for approximately two hours. The discussions were intensive and dealt with specific issues.

"Both leaders," Marlin Fitzwater added, "were pleased with the signing of the INF agreement yesterday and the acceptance it has received around the world. They feel it signals a turning point in the promise of U.S.-Soviet relations, and we should not lose the momentum in the search for lasting peace".

He said that at today's meeting the regional issues discussed included Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war and ways to settle it. The two leaders also continued to discuss arms control particularly the START treaty. Fitzwater pointed out that "preliminary discussions" of the latter issues by the working groups had been "helpful".

"We are now discussing the question of what steps we should take following the signing of the INF Treaty," said Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"We hold that we have got an opportunity to sign a treaty on a 50 percent cut in strategic nuclear forces of our countries next year. We are also discussing the ABM Treaty issue."

Gennadiy Gerasimov also described the present meeting between the Soviet and American leaders as useful and productive.

He said the meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU and the leaders of U.S. Congress Wednesday morning as "useful and constructive exchange of views".

In reply to complaints by a number of journalists that not all correspondents would be able to get to Mikhail Gorbachev's press conference which is planned to be held at the Embassy of the USSR on Thursday, Gennadiy Gerasimov said that "everything possible was done" to enable as many people as possible to attend it. But, he had to remind, it is quite impossible for one room to accommodate all five thousand or even more of correspondents who have been accredited to cover the summit meeting.

The interest in the summit and in the forthcoming press conference is so great that all journalists seek to get to it. The organizers of Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming meeting with the press have to make a good deal of effort to satisfy all requests for participation.

PRAVDA Describes Signing

PM091449 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "Signing of the Treaty on Medium-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 8 Dec—The stirring sounds of fanfares and drums announced the beginning of the signing ceremony of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons—medium-range and shorter-range missiles—in the White House today.

...1330 hours local time. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's car, flying the USSR and U.S. flags, drives up to diplomatic entrance through the Southwest Gate.

R. Reagan greets M.S. Gorbachev at the entrance to the White House and they go up to the Red Drawing Room and from there to the East Room.

E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.F. Dobrynin, V.M. Kamentsev, S.F. Akhromeyev, A.S. Chernyayev, Yu.V. Dubinin, and prominent representatives of science and culture are in the East Room.

Also present is the U.S. Vice President G. Bush, Secretary of State G. Shultz, and other U.S. leaders.

R. Reagan walks over to the microphone. He says: [passage omitted, speech reported on page 14 of 9 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

And now, Mr General Secretary, would you like to say a few words before we sign the treaty?

M.S. Gorbachev addresses those present. He says: [passage omitted, speech reported on page 15 of the 9 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

The speeches of R. Reagan and M.S. Gorbachev are greeted with applause.

The leaders of the two countries walk over to the table flanked by the state flags of the Soviet Union and the United States. With their signatures they seal the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—a document which represents an act of goodwill and new thinking backed up by reciprocal steps. It is equally important for both the USSR and the United States and for the improvement of the international climate throughout the planet.

After the signing of the treaty a conversation took place between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in the White House Oval Office.

More on 'Intel!igentsia'

LD100108 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Question and Answer session following Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with U.S. intellectuals at the Soviet Embassy in Washington on 9 December—recorded; U.S. participants speak in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Gorbachev] We have almost 40 minutes left. Perhaps someone wanted to say something about something.

[Unidentified man] Mr Gorbachev, the majority of Americans like what you say. Many believe you, and I am one of them. You put it very well when you said that the real problem between our countries was not weapons, but the mistrust and fear that existed between our peoples. The governments of our countries can and must act in such a way as to remove this mistrust. While governments have guns, people have arms with which they can embrace each other. That is why we are in such need of a program within the framework of which scientists, intellectuals, and educational workers can visit and meet each other. Our peoples and governments ought to maintain friendly relations with each other. Thank you. [applause]

[Gorbachev] This is democracy. Who wants to speak?

[John Denver] I am afraid I sing better than I speak, but I would like to say something all the same. There are problems here which we have to tackle together. No doubt we have great opportunities here before us. There is, for instance, such a problem as combating hunger. Relations of partnership are needed between the USSR and United States to stop the pollution of the environment. That is the only way to understand that we are a single family, that we live together on one planet.

[Gorbachev] Listen, what about such a project as the flight to Mars? After all, it is beyond the powers of one country to solve this problem, but dealing with it would give a strong push forward to the whole of science and technology. Well, is there a lack of problems? In my opinion, in the sphere of medicine—Doctor Lown can confirm this...[sentence left incomplete] Did anybody else want to say something? Please, Mrs Montandon.

[Montandon] Mr General Secretary, now, at this very moment, not only is this historic summit meeting taking place, but also another summit meeting, between children—(Katya Lucheva) from the Soviet Union and (Stara Walls) from San Francisco now are travelling through the United States, under our auspices and those of the Soviet Peace Committee, telling our children about your country and answering questions about the Soviet Union. I would like to ask you this: What do you think of these efforts by children? They are very close to my heart, and thank you for what you are doing. [Montandon is heard to add in English: "We applaud you for it."] [video shows Yakovlev and Mrs Gorbachev seated together at a table as Montandon speaks]

[Gorbachev] I welcome everything being done to expand contacts between our young people and children. It is necessary to prepare those generations that are coming to take our place to construct relations differently. However, it is we who are sowing the seeds. If you do not sow seeds, there will be no shoots and no harvest. So, one must sow seeds and there will be a harvest.

[Unidentified man] General Secretary, last week one of your physicists who was in our laboratory said that it would be difficult for the United States to reduce its arms, for then the U.S. military industry would have nothing to do. I said to him: Look at the main thing; we make these arms, but the main thing is that we hope it will not be necessary to use them. At the end of the day, if we cannot somehow redistribute resources and can make, not missiles, but motor vehicles and computers, who knows what we can do?

[Gorbachev] There are many tasks to which the potential possessed by the military industry in the Soviet Union and the United States—and especially the scientific potential—can be directed. I must say that the whole of civilian industry and the peoples as a whole would only gain even more from this. I see no insurmountable obstacles here.

[Another unidentified man] Mr General Secretary, it seems to me that our discussion has given rise to interesting considerations which enrich us, and it seems

to me that you should take away this impression. It is possible to do much more besides that which is done at government level, in order to exploit all these opportunities.

[Gorbachev] You know, I submitted a proposal to the President today: Let us set up a committee of scientists from our countries. This would be a committee that would take in the very best—the elite, so to speak—of our two states. They could present their scientific, independent analysis to both the U.S. Administration and to the Soviet Union. It would be of great importance for arranging policy correctly. I have not yet received a reply. [applause]

[Same unidentified man continues] I would like to add this: It is necessary, so to speak, to weave the fabric of relations between great powers not only at the level of organized exchanges, but at the level of such a spontaneous initiative, so that this might penetrate into all levels of our societies.

[Gorbachev] That is a very profound thought.

[Another unidentified man] Mr General Secretary, I am a representative of the National Council of Churches, and, as you know, one of the sources of fear of the Soviet Union is the position of religious right-wing circles in our country. I want to say to you that for more than 30 years, the U.S. National Council of Churches and Soviet churches have been doing a very great deal to remove these apprehensions. I want to express appreciation to you for your policy of glasnost and restructuring, which also has helped to improve our reputation because people have begun to believe that much of what we have saying for many years is, indeed, true.

[Gorbachev] You know, next year we will have the 1,000th anniversary of the adoption of Christianity in Rus. This will be a major event. Representatives of our church are here [Video cuts away from Gorbachev to show an Orthodox clergyman seated at one of the tables] and they can tell you in reality about the processes in progress in this sphere. Perhaps there is something we do not know, perhaps there is something happening that creates some kind of false image regarding the subject, so to speak, regarding the sphere of religious faith. However, we do not have this drama in our country.

[Orthodox clergyman] I am grateful for the opportunity to thank you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, on behalf of the churches in the Soviet Union, for this openness of yours, which all sections of our Soviet society, including believers, have sensed.

[Unidentified man] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I want to ask a question concerning my profession. I'm a Sovietologist. The point here is that we must understand each other better. We have among us a particular group of intellectuals, leading U.S. Sovietologists. On the other hand, this meeting is attended by people from your country who study the United States. In your country, regrettably, we do not have a very high reputation. Sovietology is almost a term of abuse, but to be honest, in our country, too, your Americanologists do not enjoy a high reputation. [laughter in audience] Nevertheless, we are paid for trying to understand each other. What do we do about it? [laughter]

[Gorbachev] I think you should meet for a seminar. [laughter and applause] We will assist in it.

Thank you, an enormous thank-you for this meeting. I believe that one of the great desires that I wished to realize in the context of this visit has come to pass. I liked the atmosphere of our meeting very much. I wish to end the way I began. Let us again ponder what we must do to draw closer together, to ensure that mutual understanding and cooperation will grow. I am convinced that this is possible, although it is no simple thing. The obstructions are large, and a large bulldozer is needed. Some people still can continue to create these obstructions, but others can be inventing a new and more powerful bulldozer to help remove these obstructions from the road as soon as possible. Let us pick the route of meeting each other half-way. I think that our peoples and the world await this.

I once was on holiday in Italy with Raisa Maksimovna at a cooperative holiday center on the Mediterranean, and an international concert was put on in the evening. [video shows approximately 16-second medium close-up of a smiling Raisa] There was, in particular, a part of the concert in which amateur actions demonstrated how representatives of different nationalities greet each other. Then it came about that a Russian and an American walked toward each other. They approached one another; the Russian turned his head away in this direction and the American in that direction [Gorbachev gestures to the left and right], and they walked past without looking at each other, to the general laughters of the 4,000 people on holiday there.

[Raisa Gorbacheva] Mikhail Sergeyevich, it was in 1971.

[Gorbachev] In 1971, Citta del Mare—perhaps some of you have even been there. I thought: How the world is laughing at us! Surely we can provide a different impetus? We can; I am convinced. The time has come, the time has come, and it has not yet passed. Thank you. [video shows Gorbachev rising, the audience doing likewise and applauding. During the final remarks, the camera dwells at one point on Yakovlev and Mrs Gorbachev, with Akhromeyev seated behind them.]

Shultz Hosts Luncheon

LD091932 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Secretary of State of the United States George Shultz today held a luncheon at the Department of State in honour of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

Present from the Soviet side were the Soviet officials accompanying the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on his visit.

George Shultz and Mikhail Gorbachev exchanged speeches which were received with applause.

Before the luncheon George Shultz and Mikhail Gorbachev inspected a photo display about the Soviet Union arranged by TASS. It also featured photographs devoted to the beginning of the Soviet leader's visit to the United States.

Shultz Toasts Gorbachev

LD092103 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Following is the full text of the luncheon toast by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee:

Mr General Secretary, Mrs Gorbachev, distinguished guests,

Benjamin Franklin, the father of American diplomacy, who exchanged correspondence with Catherine the Great—and for whom this room is named—would be fascinated to be with us today. For this is the first time the leader of the Soviet Union has visited the Department of State. Welcome.

Your visit here, Mr General Secretary, and the prospect of a visit by President Reagan to Moscow, should cause us to think about guidelines for managing our relations. What should we both be keeping in mind?

First, ours is a relationship as important as it is unique. It is important because we each bear an immense burden of leadership in the world. It is unique because the nuclear era demands that we engage each other despite our profound differences. As you said in your book, Mr General Secretary, "There is no getting away from each other."

Second, our relationship will continue to be a difficult one to manage. We have contrasting philosophies, political systems and national interests. Our basic values, systems and interests will persist, even as the necessity to work together increases.

Third, we must be realistic, avoiding extremes either of hostility or euphoria through the ups and downs of our relations. The best approach to dealing with one another is one Ben Franklin might have suggested: Be down-to-earth, pragmatic and businesslike in seeking to solve concrete problems.

Fourth, we must speak with clarity and candour to one another about our differences. That is why at this summit we have stressed the fundamental importance we attach to human rights, as set forth in the universal declaration and the Helsinki Final Act. As the European Community heads of government stated December 5, "Respect for human rights and freedom is a prerequisite for confidence, understanding and cooperation." We have spoken with candour about regional issues as well. You have not hesitated to speak your mind to us. And we have made some progress. As President Reagan has said, we owe each other the tribute of candour, and candour will help get results.

Fifth, we must look to the future without neglecting the lessons of the past. Too often we face the past and back into the future. In five to ten years, our world will be vastly different from the one we know today—and from the post-war world of the past forty years which has conditioned so much of our thinking. Franklin—and Lomonosov, his contemporary—were ready, and eager, for the future. So should we be. The material substances of daily life are being transformed. The speed of human transactions is accelerating. Scientific, economic and political matters are now global in dimension. And through all these changes runs the thread of knowledge: its discovery, its rapid transmission as information that openness to ideas, information and contacts is the key to future success. [sentence as received] The conceptual breakthroughs embodied in the INF Treaty's provisions for verification and on-site inspection are but one example of the powerful pull which openness is already exerting in a key area of our relations.

We must seek steady progress toward a more open, more predictable, more stable and constructive relationship. In this time of change, a complicated interplay of international relationships complicate the management of our bilateral affairs. But new patterns of interaction also offer new opportunities for cooperation and progress. Let us grasp those opportunities.

Mr General Secretary, Mrs Gorbachev, to your health, to the health of the President and Mrs Reagan, and to the Soviet and American peoples.

Gorbachev Luncheon Speech

LD092137 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 9 Dec 87

["Summit—Gorbachev luncheon speech"—TASS take identifier]

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Following is the full text of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at a luncheon given in his honour by the State Department. [Moscow TASS in English at 2153 GMT on 9 December carries a corrected version of this item, adding the preceding sentence]

Esteemed Mr Secretary of State and Mrs Shultz,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me to express the gratitude for the invitation to such an authoritative institution as the State Department of the United States of America. A great deal in international politics depends on those who work here. In any case, the event which we witnessed yesterday and in which we participated would not have taken place without their part.

The President of your country and I signed yesterday the treaty on the elimination of an entire class of nuclear weapons, two classes, to be more precise. The world will be rid as a result of approximately 2,000 lethal warheads, altogether. This is not a very large number. But the importance of the treaty goes far beyond the limits of its concrete contents.

We assess it as the beginning of the implementation of the program for the construction of a world without nuclear arms, which I proposed on behalf of the Soviet leadership and Soviet people nearly two years ago, on January 15, 1986.

I have been asked more than once since then if I continue to believe that that program is realistic. I answer yes, certainly. The signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles shows that the road to this aim is far from easy, but it also shows that it is the right road and that the aim is feasible.

The will of hundreds of millions of people operates in this direction. They come to realize that as the 20th century is running out, the civilization has approached the divide between not so much systems and ideologies as common sense, the instinct of self-preservation of humankind, on the one hand, and irresponsibility, national egoism, prejudice, in a word, old thinking, on the other.

Humanity comes to realise that it has fought enough wars, that wars should be banished.

Two world wars and the exhaustive cold war alongside "local conflicts" that have taken and continue taking the toll of millions of lives is too high a price to pay for adventurism, conceit, disregard for the interests and rights of others, unwillingness or inability face the realities, to show consideration for the right of all peoples to make their own choice and have a place in the sun.

This means that the lofty ideals of humanists of all times—the ideals of peace, freedom, the awareness of the value of every human life—should be the basis of practical policy.

Each new step in world development, given sound and responsible approach to it, enables us to grasp problems more profoundly and equips us with additional opportunities for their solution.

It is essential not [to] let these opportunities slip, to use them to the utmost for the construction of a more secure world, rid of trappings and psychology of militarism, a more democratic world.

It won't be an overstatement to say that this step—I mean the treaty signed—and its preparations were truly instructive. They enriched our two countries and world politics with the recognition of the significance of difficult but simple truths. It will be appropriate to mention some of them.

First of all, in meeting each other halfway we came to appreciate still more the role and importance of Soviet-American relations in present-day international development, and at the same time, our great responsibility not only to our peoples but also to the world community.

Second, we have become aware how important the support for our efforts by our allies is, moreover, what a substantial reserve is contained in their ideas, advice, in their real and engaged participation, in coordinating our actions with them.

Third, we have tested in practice how important is the understanding of one's intentions, proposals and plans by the allies of one's partners and, certainly, sympathy and solidarity, and even a simple wish of success from many developing and non-aligned countries, large and small.

All this confirmed convincingly a simple but very important truth that peace today is not a monopoly of a state or group of states, no matter how powerful. Peace is the concern and destiny of many, and in an increasing degree of all. And wherever many interact, reciprocity is indispensable and compromises cannot be avoided.

Peace from the positions of strength is intrinsically fragile, no matter what is said about it. In its very nature it is based on confrontation—covert or overt, on the constant danger of outbreaks, on the temptations to use force.

Over the centuries humanity was compelled to put up with such a really lean peace. But we can tolerate this no longer.

Some people think that in drafting the treaty the Soviet side conceded too much, while others think that it is the U.S. side that made too many concessions.

I think that neither view is right. Each side conceded exactly as much as necessary in order to balance their interests in the given concrete area.

Creating the atmosphere of contacts, of direct communication, getting to know each other better, without which it would be more difficult to achieve the treaty, we realized more profoundly, as I hope you realized, too, that it is above all necessary to preserve peace so that we

should all remain different, live in our homes the way we choose and have the opportunity to hold disputes with each other and assert our views.

A fundamentally new important step, if a modest one, was made today toward a more equitable, more humane order in international relations. One would like to hope that the subsequent steps will not be long in coming. Besides that, it is easier to continue a good undertaking, relying on the experience of the work already carried out.

We are all now on a transition from the knowledge as dogma to the knowledge as thinking. We have embarked on restoring peacemaking predestination of politics. It should not be any longer the continuation of war by other means, the way it happened in the 20th century after the ending of world wars.

As politics change, the predestination of diplomacy changes, too. It is called upon to seek out seeds of accord even in the sea of differences and to turn the possible into realities.

The diplomatic services of our two countries had to exert themselves much in recent years. And noting the truly historic event, the signing of the treaty, moreover, while staying here, one should pay tribute to the many who applied their minds, drive, patience, persistence, knowledge, a sense of duty to their people and the international community. I would like above all to commend Comrade Eduard Shevardnadze and Mr George Shultz.

I would like to say a kindly word also about diplomats working abroad. They were not merely conducting negotiations. In the capitals of their host countries they helped people realize what can be achieved and what cannot, what is promising and what is so far not fesible.

I liked the thought expressed in a recent article in an American newspaper that diplomacy is the first line of a country's defences and the forward line in the struggle for peace.

But foreign policy ceased to be the domain of professionals alone. The practice of accords and agreements deceiving peoples and dooming them to actions and sacrifices running counter to their vital interests becomes a thing of the past. Any falsity, any untruth becomes revealed one way or another.

In this characteristic feature of the present I see an earnest of genuine democratization of inter-state relations. In a strong field of human attraction, attention and exacting demands on people authorized to represent their states in other countries, they should constantly account for their steps and explain them.

Besides that, they are on the sensitive line of the contact of cultures and much depends on them in the understanding of one people by another. And this is extremely important now in politics, too.

The presence in this hall of outstanding representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union is not a mere concession to protocol and etiquette. This is the evidence of the fact that a political course of a better mutual understanding between our countries has an authoritative support.

This support inspired us on the long and arduous road to the agreement about the beginning of real nuclear disarmament. But since we do not intend to halt at the start of the road, this support will be needed also tomorrow, when we shall continue joint work to eliminate the biggest and the most dangerous part of our nuclear arsenals.

In this connection I would like to mention such a reserve for the relations between our countries as contacts between scientists and workers in culture. It is they precisely who largely shape national awareness and attitude to other nations. And precisely for this reason they find the common language quicker, creating the necessary background also for politics. The role of the intelligentsia of the two countries in relations between our peoples and states is large and important.

In the language of ordinary human communication, in Russian and in English, what we have achieved here means the revival of hope. Force is a variable and unstable category, while truth achieved by honest work is constant, for it is human.

We are now closer to truth than we were yesterday.

My congratulations to you.

Attendees Reported

LD101011 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2324 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Excerpt] Washington, 9 Dec—(A special TASS correspondent). U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz gave a luncheon in the State Department today in honor of M.S. Gorbachev.

Present from the Soviet side were E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.F. Dobrynin, V.M. Kamentsev, S.F. Akhromeyev, A.S. Chernyayev, and figures of science and culture. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Meets With Congressmen

LD092259 Moscow TASS in English 2253 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev today had a meeting here with the leaders of the United States Congress. Taking part in it were James Wright, Thomas Foley, Robert Michel, Tony Coelho, Trent Lott, Robert Byrd, Robert Dole, Alan Cranston, and Alan Simpson.

Present from the Soviet side were Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Vladimir Kamentsev [Moscow TASS in English on 9 December at 1516 GMT carries a shorter version of this report, not including Gorbachev's address. In the list of attendees at the meeting, this TASS report at this point includes the following: "First Deputy Minister of Defence of the USSR Sergey Akhromeyev, assistant to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Chernyayev"] and other officials.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee addressed the congressmen.

Mikhail Gorbachev's speech:

I am glad to see you in this hall. When still in Moscow, when we were considering the program of this visit, we felt that contacts and meeting with the leaders of the U.S. Congress should be an important element of our program. And that is only too understandable as Congress is indeed a most important element in the political process in the United States of America. Nothing can happen in the USA without its participation, just as in our country nothing can happen without the participation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Due to common effort and meeting each other half way, we arrived at yesterday's event—a unique event in the history not only of our relations, but of international relations generally. A very big step has been taken, and I think we can congratulate each other on having taken it. I have familiarized myself with the initial reaction in the world to the act of the signing of the treaty, and I can see that it evoked great response in the world. Proceeding from yesterday's event, I would like to invite you all to think together on a very important theme, in effect: How are we going to live together in this world of ours? For instance, I can feel there is a great desire among broad sections of the Soviet people for the bettering of our relations, and I feel there is a similar movement among the American public. But if this mood of the people all over the USA and the USSR is not really perceived in the political institutions such as Congress, and the Supreme Soviet, the United States Administration and the Government of the USSR, this process will not have the necessary impetus.

On the eve of my depature for Washington I had several international meetings, specifically, with the Australian prime minister and the Zambian president. They have come from the opposite corners of the world. And all the conversations started with their telling me: You are going to the United States for a visit, be sure to do everything that your relations start changing for the better. So we all bear vast responsibility. And it is not only the responsibility to our peoples. Peoples the world over want our relations to improve. There is incipent progress in our relations on a political plane. More senators and congressmen now come to the Soviet Union. We have always attached much importance to such visits. And I am sure that you have seen for yourself that we all want the dialogue between parliamentarians to be serious, to become broader. That was my first point.

And my second point would be this. Ahead lies the process of disarmament that is by no means an easy process. What we want is to try and see to it that this burden be lightened as far as possible so that it should not press heavily on the United States and the Soviet Union. And when I say this, many people, I would say not farsighted people speculate that Gorbachev is not having an easy time if he's come to the USA and talks about easing the burden of the arms race on the Soviet Union.

But to that let me say that that is not the case. The point of the matter is to have a true understanding of the problem. The arms race greatly complicates the political dialogue and other ties and is affecting economic processes in both our countries. We can see how high are the mountings [as received] of arms we have amassed as a result of the arms race. And we are sitting atop of that all. And just consider what would happen if it should suddenly go into effect, if it comes out of our control. If we are all aware of that, we should try to move towards each other. I welcome the fact that through a difficult dialogue, realistic thought, nevertheless, is seeking to make a way for itself in public and political circles, both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

We believe the time has come for our political institutes, the main, supreme institutes to become aware of this urgent need and realize it in politics.

Yesterday we took but a first step. It relates to not more than five per cent of the nuclear arsenals, but its political importance is much greater, for the most difficult step has been taken. It seems to me that since the American side and the Soviet side have all be very restrict [as received] in scrutinizing our approaches to the treaty and felt that this is not a simple matter, you should bear in mind that for the first time in our country this matter was proceeding not easily. I told the President yesterday that many questions are asked in our society, questions are asked of the general secretary and the government, openly, in the press, to say nothing of letters, whether the Soviet leadership was right in reducing three to four times greater volumes of nuclear weapons. For that matter, the Gallup Institute and our own Institute of Public Opinion had a poll taken in the United States and the USSR, and it turned out that half of the population of the Soviet Union said that we should carefully consider if the signing of this treaty will not be damaging the security interests of the Soviet Union. Now, that was

news to us, I must tell you. So we feel that we will have to work with our public opinion and with the Supreme Soviet. Perhaps for the first time the process of ratification in our own country will not go through so easily. But insofar as I was deeply involved with the treaty, including its details, I would like to say that it is a very seriously elaborated treaty. And the main thing is that we had arrived at quite unprecedented machinery of verification. This is important not only for this treaty. This also engenders the hope that when we approach the stage of cutting strategic arms, we can put to good use the experience we have gained. This is an example of how the coincidence of interests can be established and acted upon even in such a delicate matter as verification.

The congressmen who took [the] floor thanked Mikhail Gorbachev for pithy and sincere conversation during which most important questions of Soviet-American relations and international situation were discussed in a spirit of complete openness. Speaker of the House of Representatives James Wright said that everything which is now taking place in Washington, including the agreement signed yesterday means a good initial step on the road to a better mutual understanding and more fruitful relations between the two great countries. Addressing Mikhail Gorbachev he said he had been very frank with the congressmen today and that they all admired what he was doing and trying to achieve in the Soviet Union. James Wright said he only regretted the fact that not all of his colleagues had an opportunity to take part in so frank a discussion. He said he was absolutely confident that the people of the USSR just as the people of the USA sincerely wished peace and that everybody's duty was to do everything within one's power to achieve this goal.

The Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd said that he intended to start discussing the INF Treaty in the Senate in March next year and expressed the hope that the process of ratification will be concluded in April. He expressed concern over a slow pace of the talks on conventional armaments.

The Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole declared for lifting discriminatory restrictions on Soviet-American trade. He recalled that two years back he had been declaring for abandoning the Jackson-Vanik amendment which, as is known, hampers normal development of economic relations between the two countries.

Deputy leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate Alan Cranston welcomed new thinking in the Soviet Union and expressed the hope that the leaders of the two countries will be able to work out an agreement on the reduction of the strategic nuclear arsenals.

Further on Meeting

LD091656 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Special correspondent Aleksandr Belikov, Vitaliy Chukseyev and Gennadiy Shishkin write:

The General secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev today had a meeting with leaders of the United States Congress. Key issues of Soviet-American relations and the international situation were discussed during this meeting in a businesslike and constructive spirit.

In his remarks Mikhail Gorbachev welcomed the development of contacts between the two legislative bodies of the USSR and the United States. "This enriches political dialogue and gives a better idea of each other's positions and mentality". Touching on the signing of the treaty on intermediate ar[illegible]orter-range missiles Mikhail Gorbachev said: "C[illegible] this first step we fulfilled the will of both the [illegible] American peoples, justified the hopes and [illegible]f the entire world community. We are face[illegible]copeful tasks. I refer to the reduction of [illegible]ms".

Mikhail Go[illegible]tre of responsibility was now shi[illegible]et of the USSR and the Congres[illegible]s. "As to the Soviet Union, I kn[illegible], the Supreme Soviet of the USSR have alrea[illegible]rted studying the content of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. And I hope their decision will be a positive one, although I do not rule out the possibility of discussions in the relevant commissions of the Supreme Soviet. Of course you know best what the situation on your side will be like. But in any case we understand that these are serious matters concerning the fundamental interests of our peoples, and the whole of mankind for that matter".

Then the Soviet leader said that the question of chemical and conventional weapons was now acquiring a much more urgent nature. "The Soviet Union and its allies want the most radical (including with due account for assymetry) reductions of conventional armaments and armed forces and are prepared for such changes in the military doctrine, structure and deployment of armed forces that would rule out the slightest possibility of a sudden attack, aggression from any side whatsoever. We have made a number of concrete proposals and are waiting for the response from the West".

Mikhail Gorbachev suggested the creation of a Soviet-American working group of legislators which would promptly busy itself with studying and discussing questions of conventional armaments and armed forces.

Congressmen Cited

LD100617 Moscow TASS in English 0350 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 10 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko reports:

Following the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on Wednesday, influential senators and congressmen attending it held several press conferences relating their impressions.

Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic Majority in the U.S. Senate, described the exchange of views as highly useful.

"It was a very useful meeting, very free, very unrestrained, one in which the general secretary responded to every question that we made", said Jim Wright, speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Journalists' particular interest was aroused by the question about prospects for Senate ratification of the INF Treaty.

Robert Dole, leader of the Republican minority of the U.S. Senate said he had already appointed a coordinating group consisting of eleven Republican senators to study the treaty.

He added that some of the members of the group adhered to highly conservative convictions.

Robert Michel, leader of the Republican minority in the U.S. House of Representatives, positively assessed the Soviet-U.S. treaty.

"I personally happen to think that the INF Treaty is a good one, and it ought to be supported, and that we have guarantees in there on on-site inspections", he pointed out.

During the meeting with journalists, Jim Wright, speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, was asked this question: "Is there any sentiment in Congress to go to a nuclear-free world? Why or why not?"

"I think it would be a very fine thing to have a nuclear free world, and a world in which the oppressive level of weapons was not so great that it sapped such a disproportionate share of our budgets and of our resources, and of our strength," Mr Wright answered.

"It would be good for all people all over the world. You see, we have between us some 60,000 nuclear warheads, with a total destructive capacity one million times greater than the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. We have in our hands, these two countries, enough destructive power to demolish every city on earth, or to kill one another off several times over. One nuclear submarine today carries more destructive power than all the bombs that were dropped on all the nations during all the years of World War Two".

"Every day, this year, the nations of the world have been spending about two billion dollars on armaments, while every day somewhere in the world, 40,000 people have been dying from starvation or want of inexpensive vaccines. And so, the conscience of mankind, I think, cries out for an end to the insane race of arms which just leapfrogs one another in taking of our treasure that otherwise we need to pay off our debts or to have better education, or to make the search into cures for some of the diseases that plague mankind". [sentence as received]

"We could make much better use of that 300 billion dollars than weapons", said the speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Gorbachev Meets Media Leaders

LD100325 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] [Announcer] A conversation took place today between Comrade Gorbachev and leading publishers and editors of the United States at the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Beginning it, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0700 GMT on 10 December carries an 8-minute recording of CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev's address to U.S. publishers and editors. The reports have been compared and found to be similar; here, the TV version adds the following: "I want to continue what I started to say behind those doors, on the threshold of this hall, about what I wanted within the framework of this visit, which is of a very businesslike nature. I would say this visit is essential, precisely in such a businesslike format, and we seem to be moving in the right direction." (adding introductory paragraph)] What did I want within the framework of this visit? I would say: This visit is essential, precisely in such a format, and we seem to be moving in the correct direction. We have signed a treaty—the first document concerning the elimination of nuclear weapons. It is, in itself, an enormous event, out of the ordinary. We are having a conversation with the President and his staff on a wide range of problems, I would say.

You know, experience has probably already appeared among us. It's my third meeting with the President in 2 and 1/2 years. This experience permits us to carry on a dialogue that is worthy of the leaders of such enormous states as ours. We are saying fewer and fewer commonplace things to each other, and are becoming more involved with real politics. I especially avoided saying that we are not busy with propaganda in relation to each other because it would then seem that I have a poor regard for propaganda, and here we have representatives of just that front.

You know, I've already told both the President and his aides: The idea I want to express was already present at our meeting with representatives from scientific and cultural circles yesterday. We have a feeling in the Soviet Union that we have approached a stage at which, both among us and among you, in our countries, a tendency is manifesting itself quite clearly among broad strata and

among various circles in our countries, to sort out our relations. Are we doing everything as we should, as is worthy of our two peoples and our two great countries?

Well, all right, we've proved during the 40-odd postwar years that we can live without one another—without trading, I mean, and without maintaining contacts. But even in that situation, we were always keenly aware of each other's presence. Do we really need to prove that—that we can live without each other? Maybe something else ought to be proven—in politics and in behavior, in dialogue; through the sphere of contacts and exchanges; through the press; through the media.

We are coming to the conclusion that we are following the wrong road. That road has led us to confrontation, yet we were once allies and stood together against fascism. That road has involved us both, like no other country, in an arms race. Are we happy because we're expending resources—intellectual and material—on the arms race? Maybe someone will say: Yes, I'm happy because I've made a killing from the military industry, and another person will say: I'm happy because I've received so much profit for my newspaper or my magazine from the arms race and from the cold war, that it's splendid.

But I ask a question: Are there really so many such people, who are indifferent to the destiny of the people, indifferent to the destiny of the country, and now of the whole of our civilization, and are ready to let everything go to hell, beneath the knife or the hammer, just so as to add to their profits an extra dollar or two?

I don't think so. There are individuals, but I don't think that today, at the present level of development of our countries, when we have great traditions, great cultural, scientific, and intellectual potential, such people prevail. No. All the same, a sense of responsibility and concern at where the world is going is most widespread, and in this connection, in this context, people are reflecting on their own country, their own people, but, naturally, on their own affairs, too. I do not want to say that this does not exist—personal interests and initiative are also an essential and necessary thing, and justified.

If we think over how we have been proceeding since the war, in what direction, very great obstructions have arisen in our relations. In the Soviet Union, in the Soviet leadership, we altogether reached the conclusion that we could not continue to conduct affairs between our states like that. This has an effect not only on our countries, it has a powerful effect on the (?whole) international situation, too. People say bluntly—and perhaps you'll be able to confirm this, I don't know, you have great ties with politicians all over the world—people say bluntly: When will you, the United States and the Soviet Union, learn to live normally, to conduct normal affairs, because as long as you don't learn to behave and act like that, nothing will come off in the world. We all depend on you. That is the situation.

It is a colossal role and a greatest responsibility to others. So, Mr (?Hayden) [not further identified], if we only look to the past, in order to find stereotypes from there, and ways of acting in one situation or another, and to seek there answers to the problems of today, we shall get caught up and we will not clamber out of this rut, this tension, this constant political and economic squabbling, and, most important, of course, the arms race.

All this must change. We have to understand that this has yielded nothing, apart from us taking an immense, heavy load on our shoulders. We are sitting atop mountains of nuclear and other weapons. Is this a happy position? I am sure that an attempt to dominate, by the United States or the USSR, has no future. It is beyond even them today. The world will no longer consent to these approaches, and it no longer recognizes them. So we are all the time getting, one after the other, peripheral [na periferii] events that you then describe in your media.

I am sure that we must think over the situation in which our relations now lie. We cannot remain hostages to past stereotypes. We must look at the contemporary world realistically, and we shall notice that we are not only in confrontation although we are different, but we need each other. [sentence as heard] If we recognize this and start to proceed toward each other and to seek solutions, both at the level of politics and political dialogue, in the disarmament and economic fields, and in the sphere of cultural and intellectual relations, we shall be able—especially with the combined scientific potential which our two peoples possess—we shall be able to provide acceleration of the whole process for the whole of our civilization. That will indeed be something worthy of our two great peoples. [Here the TV version adds: "That's all I wanted to say to you."]

We are prepared to seek ways and approaches together with you, and we ask you to consider all of this; we ask you to consider it. I am very much under the great impression of the mood of our people and of your people. Yesterday I read two or three letters: young people, accusing the older generation of being incapable of arranging relations as they ought to be constructed, and of preparing a future for young people, for their own children, of which they ought to be ashamed. Now listen: It is we who have reached such a spot, such a point, such a frontier. Let us stop and think at once, let us hope that for all the particular issues and everything that comes up in our relations—and not only in our relations but in international politics—ways of solving the problems that occur will be found quickly, and new mechanisms will come into being. That's all I wanted to say now. What do you think? [end recording]

[Announcer] Then an exchange of views on various problems of the present day took place.

Denies Split in Politburo

LD100121 Moscow World Service in English 0100 GMT 10 Dec 87

[text] Mikhail Gorbachev has said he is satisfied with the broad support for the treaty on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles from the Soviet and the American people.

As he addressed leading American mass media workers in Washington, Mikhail Gorbachev emphatically dismissed rumors in the Western press that the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee was split on the issue of missiles and perestroyka, or renewal. He said such rumors were nonsense. He said there was no split in the Politburo and that he was confident there wouldn't be any. He said there was no split in the Central Committee or any opposition forces in society.

Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized the need for cropping stereotypes and the enemy image in describing the other side.

Gorbachev Hosts Embassy Dinner

LD100044 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0023 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington, 10 Dec (TASS special correspondent)—M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a dinner in honor of U.S. President R. Reagan in the Soviet Embassy on Wednesday.

Present in the hall were U.S. Vice President G. Bush; J. Wright, speaker of the House of Representatives; W. Rehnquist, chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state; the secretaries of defense—F. Carlucci; and of trade—W. Verity; representatives of the White House and the U.S. State Department; business circles; and other officials.

On the Soviet side E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.F. Dobrynin, V.M. Kamentsev, S.F. Akhromeyev, A.S. Chernyayev, and scientific and cultural figures were present.

M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan exchanged speeches, which were greeted with applause.

Yelena Obraztsova, People's Artiste of the USSR, performed before those taking part in the dinner.

Addresses Reagan, Guests

LD100224 Moscow TASS in English 0215 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today gave a dinner in the Soviet Embassy in honour of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

Following is the full text of Gorbachev's speech at the dinner:

Esteemed Mr. President,

Esteemed Mrs. Reagan,

Ladies and gentlemen,

Comrades,

The second day of our talks is over. The talks are proceeding in a frank and businesslike atmosphere.

In the centre of our attention are major problems both of Soviet-American relations and of world politics.

I have the impression that we have made progress in a number of serious issues, and this inspires optimism. There remain areas, however, in which the divergences are great.

I ought to say, Mr. President, that I have the feeling that what we are discussing with you is so significant for the entire world that we constantly sense its keen attention and interest in what is happening here.

This is only natural. The decisions that we will adopt, the results that we will attain may become crucial for the destinies of the world. This is the point at issue today. Such is the scope of our responsibility.

Without confidence in the future, without faith that one's children and grandchildren will enjoy life, the joy of existence fades. No benefits of modern civilization, no achievements of the scientific and technological revolution can make up for that.

Our great Russian poet Aleksandr Pushkin said: The joy of life is the best university.

We would like to be involved in the establishment of a "university" whose curriculum would not have such "subjects" as enmity between nations, suspicion and disrespect for another people, disregard for its interests, fear and coercion.

Such a "university" would teach how to live together in the present-day complex and multi-faceted world.

As to our idea of a nuclear-free future, it is, as we understand, is close to the public thought in America. [sentence as received]

Back in 1945 at a time when the first atomic bomb was made, outstanding American scientists who took part in its development came out against production and use of this terrible weapon.

Of course, bombs and missiles have no power of thinking, even though people do equip them with an "electronic brain." This mechanism is deprived of soul and conscience and, therefore, is more dangerous than any madman.

There is no issue—be it conventional arms, regional conflicts or human rights—on which it would be impossible today to reach understanding or make progress, if, naturally, one regards it honestly and seriously.

The world is interconnected and interdependent not only because a nuclear catastrophe would not spare anyone. Growing with every passing year is the risk connected with the fact that the poles of wealth and poverty get apart more and more widely. To solve the problem is one of the huge tasks involved in protecting the contemporary world from annihilation.

Investments in disarmament and peace are the most reliable and promising input of capital.

Shortly before the trip here I was shown a youth newspaper called "Bridge" which American boys who had visited the Soviet Union this year began to publish. Together with Moscow schoolchildren they had set up a camp of friendship near the ancient Russian town of Pereslavl-Zalesskiy not far from Moscow.

Their pursuits there included computers, telecommunications, sports, music, the Russian and English languages, games and excursions—everything they are capable of. The American children now write about their impressions.

I am not sure that anyone of you held this newspaper in your hands. But it deserves most serious attention. This is a significant phenomena. This is a school of human contacts in which we adults should learn from our children.

Children show to us an example of how one should get rid of prejudices and boring stereotypes.

It turns out that it is possible easily and naturally to establish most friendly and close relations and to regard the citizens of another country with trust and jointly create something useful.

This greatly ennobles one and makes both sides more humane, simple and, I would say, more clever.

The history of relationships between our peoples and states is rich in various pages. Some of them are inspiring while others evoke bitter feelings. Much has been spoilt over the past forty years.

Nevertheless, in my deep conviction, everything positive, and there is not so little of it, can be of benefit to both peoples. As far as Soviet people are concerned, they can value both the good, and kind words.

We shall never forget the American sea convoys to Murmansk and the sacrifices for the sake of the common victory and, of course, the link-up on the Elbe.

We also remember the factories built in the first five-year plan periods with the assistance of American engineers and workers, the joint work of scientists who battled against serious ailments of the century, and the joint space flight.

Our confrontation and antagonism have their causes in the evaluation of which there is no agreement. However, peace and cooperation are much more wise than confrontation and unfriendlieness.

Peace to the peoples of the United States of America and the Soviet Union!

Peace to the peoples of planet earth!

I wish Mr President and his wife and all guests of our home health and happiness.

Till we meet in Moscow.

Reagan Replies

LD101008 Moscow TASS in English 0959 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 10 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Wednesday gave a dinner for U.S. President Ronald Reagan at the Soviet Embassy here.

Gorbachev made a speech at the dinner (it was carried by TASS as a separate item).

A speech in reply was made by Reagan. He said:

Mr. General Secretary, Mrs. Gorbachev,

Foreign Minister Shevardnadze,

Ambassador and Mrs. Dubinin,

Ladies and gentlemen,

We're coming to the end of the second full day of your visit to our land. It's been an eventful two days. But now that you've seen our nation's capital, Mr. General Secretary, I only wish that you could have a chance to meet the people who normally work and do business here. Unfortunately, they're all in Iowa and New Hampshire—campaigning for my job.

As everyone in the United States knows, I have a weakness for anecdotes. So if I may, I'd like to begin with a story I was so moved by recently that I mentioned it in my address to the people of the Soviet Union.

It's an account of one of our diplomats—a young man, then—stationed in our Embassy in Moscow during World War II. He was there when news of victory—VE-Day—reached that city. And he said Red Square erupted in a spontaneous demonstration of thankfulness and joy.

Our embassy's chancery was just across from the Kremlin, and many of the Americans stationed there in those days were still in uniform. When they walked outside to join in the celebration the crowd spotted them, lifted them onto their shoulders, and carried them on to Red Square. But the young diplomat said he was even more moved by the words of one Red Army major standing near him in the crowd, words filled with new-found hope—"now it's time to live," he said.

Well, Mr. General Secretary, we've accomplished much so far in this summit—a path-breaking agreement that for the first time will eliminate an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons. But I'm convinced that history will ultimately judge this summit, and its participants—not on missile count—but on how far we move together to the fulfilment of that soldier's hopes.

We have prided ourselves, Mr. General Secretary, on our realism—that we've come to this summit without illusions, with no attempts to gloss over the deep differences that divide us, differences that reach to the core of values upon which our political systems are based. But we said even so, we can make progress. Even so, we can find areas of agreement and cooperation.

But perhaps in this Christmas season we should look at an even deeper and more enduring realism. It is a reality that precedes states and governments, that precedes and surpasses the temporary realities of ideology and politics. It is the reality that binds each of us as individual souls—the bond that united Soviets and Americans in exultation and thanksgiving on that day of peace 42 years ago.

General Secretary Gorbachev, you've declared that in your own country there is a need for greater glasnost—or openness—and the world watches expectantly and with great hopes to see this promise fulfilled. When talking of openness and promising truth, you've called on the deepest hungers of the human heart, hunger shared by all, whether they be Soviet or American, or the citizens of any nation on earth. Thomas Jefferson, one of our nation's great founders and philosophers once said, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." He meant that we're born to freedom and that the need for liberty is as basic as the need for food. And he, as the great revolutionary he was, also knew that lasting peace would only come when individual souls have the freedom they crave.

What better time than in this Christmas and Hanukkah season, a season of spirit you recently spoke to, Mr. General Secretary, when you noted the millenium of Christianity in your land and spoke of the hopes of your people for a better life in a world of peace. These are hopes shared by the people of every nation, hopes for an end to war, hopes especially, in this season, for the right to worship according to the dictates of conscience.

There's an old Russian saying, "Every man is the blacksmith of his own happiness." And like all folk sayings, it contains a profound understanding of the human condition. We can, with our free will, shape our future, we can make it what that Soviet soldier saw in his vision of a better world, a vision of peace and freedom. In memory of that day in Red Square, when Soviet citizens carried American soldiers on their shoulders, in memory of that day when the Red Army embraced a new world of hope, I raise my glass.

Mr General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, thank you. And Ambassador and Mrs. Dubinin, thank you for your hospitality this evening. And for my last attempt at Russian, za vashe zdorovye (to your health).

10 Dec Agenda Announced

LD100940 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0900 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Excerpt] Washington [dateline as received]—At 1700 (Moscow time) today Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will have breakfast with George Bush, vice president of the United States. At 1830 his talks with President Ronald Reagan will continue after which at 2000, he will have lunch with Ronald Reagan. At 2200 the farewell ceremony will be held in the White House. At 2300 he will meet with representatives of U.S. business circles. Mikhail Gorbachev's news conference is slated for 0130 (11 December) at the Soviet Embassy. At 0400 the Soviet delegation will fly out of Washington. At 0500 President Reagan will address the nation. [passage omitted]

Raisa Gorbacheva Visits Gallery

LD100631 Moscow TASS in English 0340 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Raisa Gorbacheva, the wife of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today visited Washington's National Gallery of Art.

"I have been told that American visitors can tour the Louvre in Paris in 6.5 minutes," she joked. Hardly more time, only one hour, was set aside for her visit to one of the richest collections of paintings in the United States. The gallery's director, Carter Brown, suggested viewing only part of the American collection.

Brown guided Raisa Gorbacheva through the halls displaying canvases by Georgia O'Keeffe, the centenary of whose birth was marked this year. The wife of the Soviet leader noted that realistic and abstract trends were intertwined in a fascinating way in the art of O'Keeffe.

Passing into the halls showing paintings of the 19th century, she stopped at canvases by Thomas Cole, noting that there was much in common in the art of Russian and American artists of that period. "It seems that every painter reflects common traits of his time," Raisa Gorbacheva observed.

"What period of art is that," she joked entering the hall filled with reporters who immediately started firing questions at her. In her replies, Raisa Gorbacheva came out in favour of more vigorous cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States.

"The more exhibitions and other values of spiritual culture we exchange, the better we will understand each other," Raisa Gorbacheva said. She pointed out that she liked art and was a member of the Soviet Cultural Foundation headed by Academician Dmitriy Likhachev.

"We are seeking to preserve the cultural heritage and promote arts. But I'm not a professional, I'm just an amateur," she added.

After visiting the National Gallery of Art, Raisa Gorbacheva met over coffee with the U.S. President's wife, Nancy Reagan, who showed her around the White House. Asked by reporters what they discussed with Nancy Reagan, Raisa Gorbacheva said, "There are many subjects for discussion. The most important is the historic event which was the signing of the treaty."

Journalists were interested if she knew English. "We study English at school. Now some 13 million school children study English. I studied German at school. Some time ago I tried to learn English on my own," Raisa Gorbacheva answered.

Replying to another question, she said that, in Washington, she became convinced of sincerity and friendly attitude felt by ordinary Americans towards the Soviet Union. During her talk with Nancy Reagan, Raisa Gorbacheva invited her to visit the Soviet Union.

Bush Supports INF Treaty

LD101007 Moscow TASS in English 0758 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 10 TASS—Vice-President of the United States George Bush said on Wednesday that he was a staunch supporter of the treaty between the USA and the USSR on elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. This treaty enjoys broad support of the American people, though one cannot deny that a certain part of right-wing circles has come out against it.

Conservatives are trying to speculate on whom the treaty signed made the winner and whom it made the loser. Their criticism is absolutely unrightful, the vice-president said.

This treaty meets the interests of international security, George Bush said.

Shevardnadze, Shultz Meet

LD092155 Moscow TASS in English 2116 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze and the Secretary of State of the United States George Shultz had a meeting today within the framework of the talks between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the President of the United States Ronald Reagan and agreed upon and approved a statement on questions connected with the preparation of and holding within the shortest period of time of a joint experiment on testing ranges of the USSR and the United States with the aim of working out improved measures of verifying compliance with the 1974 treaty on limiting the yield of underground nuclear tests and the 1976 treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions.

The minister of foreign affairs of the USSR and the secretary of state of the United States exchanged personal notes confirming the attainment of accord on increasing the volume of direct air carriage between the USSR and the United States, including the joint operation of the Moscow-New York route by the Aeroflot and Pan American airlines within the framework of the Soviet-American agreement on air travel.

Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz exchanged also diplomatic notes on extending the period of operation of the inter-governmental Soviet-American agreement on cooperation in studies of the world ocean.

Joint Statement on Verification

LD100030 Moscow TASS in English 0025 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 10 TASS—Following is the full text of the statement by the secretary of state of the U.S. and the minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, distributed by the State Department:

In accordance with the joint statement on the problems relating to nuclear testing, adopted in Washington on September 17, 1987, the U.S. and the USSR are proceeding to design a joint verification experiment. This experiment would be conducted as soon as possible at the test sites of each other (respectively in Semipalatinsk and Nevada) for the purpose of the elaboration of improved verification measures for the 1974 Threshold Test Ban

Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. These verification measures will, to the extent appropriate, be used in further nuclear test limitation agreements which may subsequently be reached.

For the purpose of the joint verification experiment, each side will provide the other side with an opportunity to measure the yield of one or two explosions at each side's test site with yields not less than 100 kilotons and approaching 150 kilotons.

For the purpose of the joint verification experiment, each side will have the opportunity, on the basis of complete reciprocity, to measure the yields of the explosions for verification purposes, using teleseismic methods, and, at the other side's test site, hydrodynamic yield measurement methods in a satellite hole. As a yield standard, the experiment will include yield measurement by means of a hydrodynamic method in the emplacement hole.

The joint verification experiment will not be designed to produce statistically significant results, but will be conducted in such a way as to address all other concerns identified by either side regarding methods proposed by the other side for verification of the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. The sides have also agreed that the experiment will give sufficient information to resolve these concerns by providing an example of the effectiveness of the verification methods used in the joint verification experiment and by demonstrating their practicability and non-intrusiveness. The experiment will thus provide the basis for agreeing on those verification measures which could be used by either side to verify compliance by the other side with the provisions of the 1974 and 1976 treaties. The understanding has been reached that in the future each side will be entitled to apply any or all of these agreed verification measures.

In order to develop and reach agreement on specific technical and organizational parameters of the joint verification experiment the sides have agreed to establish ad hoc working groups at their negotiations.

In order to help prepare themselves to design and conduct the joint verification experiment, the sides have agreed to exchange visits of delegations to the two sides' nuclear test sites. These visits, to the USSR Semipalatinsk test site and the U.S. Nevada test site, will take place in January 1988 as the preliminary work of the next negotiating round in Geneva.

Shultz' Comments Reported

LD109955 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0500 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] New York, 10 December (TASS)—George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, gave a short interview to the ABC television company on Wednesday devoted to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. Replying to a question regarding the reasons behind the high prestige enjoyed by M.S. Gorbachev, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the United States, the head of the U.S. foreign political department said: "In my opinion, he is quite deservedly making a great impression. He is a very able man, energetic, friendly and a good interlocutor. Thus, in my opinion, it is quite justified and understandable."

Concerning the main question, Shultz continued, the final assessment of results of the summit meeting will be made after it ends. At the same time, it is already clear today that a historic treaty has been signed at the summit. The work on the other issues on the agenda at the talks is businesslike and constructive. However, it must be borne in mind that these are not simple problems, and they cannot be solved quickly.

Carlucci on Future Prospects

LD100857 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] The treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles has been signed in Washington by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. Here's what our special correspondent Spartak Alekseyev writes:

Local observers refer to this document as the first and very important step taken on the road leading to nuclear disarmament. They underline the statements by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, and by President Reagan during the signing ceremony were close in spirit and content. [as heard] This only testifies to the triumph of common sense and of the desire to go further towards a more radical solution, a 50% cut in the arsenals of offensive strategic weapons.

And now the arrow of the political compass points to Moscow, where another Soviet-U.S. summit will take place next year. In reference to next year's meeting, U.S. Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci said this in part:

[Begin Carlucci recording] (?Well, I...we're) prepared to move, but there's a lot of work that needs to be done, and I don't mean to imply in the slightest that there aren't issues or differences between us; there are large differences between us on all of these questions, (?so) nobody is glossing over these differences; they are being aired. So please don't get the impression that we're going to come to some startling conclusions tomorrow. What I am saying is: Discussions are moving at a good pace. [end recording]

Arbatov Comments on Treaty

OW091340 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1100 GMT 9 Dec 87

[From "News Center 9" program: Taro Kimura interview in Washington with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; date not given; interview conducted in English; video shows Arbatov and Kimura seated face-to-face with occasional closeups of each; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Kimura] Dr Arbatov, thank you very much for joining us. Dr Kissinger was here a while ago, and he expressed his—it is not a skepticism but he said he did not like the way it was handled, that eliminating the INF in Europe into zero only favors the USSR. It should have come down with the political decision in the meantime. You like the accord, sir?

[Arbatov] No. You know, I think what is represented by Kissinger, with all due respect to him, you see this visible here, that this idea of getting an agreement has enemies not only among the extreme right. Now it is very interesting that this traditional centrist, bipartisan Republican and Democratic community, which represents the foreign policy, defense, and security establishment, here inside of the Beltway—well maybe outside in this country—it is actually an infrastructure of the cold war. It was built during the cold war period. Their whole frame of reference is relevant to the cold war.

They can be not extremists, they can be moderates, but they suddenly became concerned now when they see that it is not simply how to make a little bit more orderly and proper the rules of the old game. But they notice that maybe the whole game will be changed, you know.

[Kimura] Before going into this sort of philosophical part of it I would like to make it sure that when conservatives or some Americans say that this accord, how do you say, just gives the USSR the superiority in the conventional force, do you disagree with this?

[Arbatov] You know, they have talked about our superiority in conventional arms for 40 years. They have a GNP three times greater, they have almost twice the population; why have they complained for 40 years? Why did not they create weapons which would be at least equal to ours? I am very suspicious about these arguments. But they complain and complain. They need these complaints. Why do they need it? It is a way to justify their nuclear armaments, big military expenditures, and their military alliance. If they are concerned with conventional weapons, the road is free. We have proposed to have really serious negotiations on conventional armaments.

[Kimura] Mr Gerasimov said at the news conference that signing this treaty is like crossing the river Rubicon. Do you feel the same way?

[Arbatov] It can be. It depends on what will be done in the future. I think that the major thing with this treaty is what will it become, an episode in history which will drag on in the same direction, or a major, you know, stage in the arms control process and process of normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations, or maybe even it will become a watershed between the past when we relied on weapons—the more weapons the more security—and the future, when we see that weapons do not guarantee security, they decrease security, and we have to use political measures. We have to disarm, to make deep cuts in armaments, we have to have meaningful dialogue, we have to establish cooperation, we have to settle crises in different regions of the world, etc.

In this sense, if we accept it as a watershed, I think it is a unique chance for the world and I hope very much that it will be so, then it will really be a historical event.

[Kimura] In the meantime, you have to admit that there are people who believe in, well, the deterrent power of the nuclear weapons. What is the USSR's conception on this ...

[Arbatov] Deterrent?

[Kimura] Yes.

[Arbatov] Well, we were never very happy with deterrence, with having nuclear hostages; the peace is maintained by a balance of terror. But it worked, more or less. But we are sure that now it cannot work. We cannot rely on it forever, you know. The first thing, if on both sides the idea becomes more and more clear that you cannot fight a nuclear war, who believes in your force of deterrence? You can have five times more nuclear weapons than you have. But if you understand that this is your side, for you to use it, the other side understands it as well. The thing is that the strategists understand it as well. Therefore, having a lot of nuclear weapons, they care about having conventional weapons, because you cannot use nuclear weapons. So this is Mad Hatter's talk. It is a lunatic's world, and we have to get away from it, and it always breeds, you know...it is not deterrence, deterrence is a fake theory, because all the nuclear weapons which are being built at the moment, new weapons, they are not deterrence weapons. They are weapons to wage nuclear war, not to deter it.

[Kimura] What you, in a way, you are believing is that zero—well ideally—the ultimate goal is zero nuclear weapons, and also...

[Arbatov,interrupting] Yes, and more than this. Not only zero nuclear weapons. Zero nuclear weapons is an important step toward the demilitarization of international relations and the life of the international community, because we are for doing away with nuclear weapons, not because we would like to shift the arms race in another direction, into chemical weapons, or biological weapons, or conventional weapons. It would be just as bad.

[Kimura] Well...

[Arbatov] And almost just as deadly.

[Kimura] Well, it is probable that the build-up of confidence between the superpowers is the way to ensure that, and both leaders pledged the effort to reach that goal. Do you think that something is building, starting to build up between the two countries?

[Arbatov] I think yes, I think yes, despite all the rhetoric of evil empire, which is so fresh in our memories. You know, I do not know of anything, any other better confidence building measure than a good arms control agreement, especially if it provides for verification measures which (?give such access) to more sensible things, and I think that unilaterally we have shown an example. We have invited congressmen to the Krasnoyarsk radar, we have made many other things. It is working.

[Kimura] Is this one of the reasons why you have shown SS-20's to CBS television?

[Arbatov] Well, of course it is just that we are changing. You know, history taught us to be tremendously cautious with military secrets, but if you are under danger all the time you become obsess[illegible] with secrecy. Now we are getting out of it. It is the new thinking, it is perestroyka.

[Kimura] Yes. Actually you have achieved a great deal with the United States, and you have mentioned the evil empire. What do you think, you personally, made President Reagan change his mind?

[Arbatov] Well, you know one cannot work against realities. President Reagan came with some set of ideas, and then in a couple of years he saw that he just cannot abstain from talks with the Soviets. He returned to the negotiations in 1981. Toward the end of his Presidency it is very funny how history plays itself out. It has remained the only chance of his to do something significant in the last year of his Presidency, and to get into history as a statesman. It is an irony, yes...

[Kimura] Yes it is.

[Arbatov]...now to have the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union here in Washington to sign an arms control treaty, and to hope to go to Moscow, to the center of evil empire, you know. [laughs] But this is how history works. Whatever we think about each other, we are doomed to live together. It is like with Japan or with China, with whomever, but we have to understand the realities of this world, small, fragile, and interdependent; it is not our task to love you or for you to love us. It is to love yourself, to understand your self interest; you have to find a modus vivendi, how to live and let live the other guy.

[Kimura] So you foresee better relations with the United States, starting...

[Arbatov, interrupting] I think we have no alternatives. There can be stupid things which will postpone it for several years more, and then we will have to pay dearly for it, but we have no ways. It does not mean to have a love affair. We do not need a love affair, but to have reasonable relations when we understand our interests. It is like with Western Europe, our relations with China, with Japan, I think for everybody. We lost the luxury, you know, to be emotional in our relations and make them according to our sympathies or antipathies. We have to understand that we have no way out.

[Kimura] Thank you very much Doctor. Thank you for being with us.

[Arbatov] Thank you.

Charikov on Opposition

LD092221 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1802 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Igor Charikov commentary from the "International Diary" program presented by Konstantin Patsyuk]

[Text] [Patsyuk] Alongside the broad stream of positive responses to the treaty that has been signed in Washington, a whole series of Western press publications are featuring, and have been doing so for a long time, material, the meaning and aim of which is to disseminate certain fears among West Europeans, confronted by the so-called Soviet threat, if the nuclear umbrella in the form of the U.S. medium-range missiles is eliminated. Particularly zealous in this campaign are the U.S. press organs, but the British ones are not lagging behind either. I hand over to my colleague, commentator Igor Charikov.

[Charikov] To our profound regret, there are more than enough examples of what has been said. Here are just a few extracts from lengthy articles in major weeklies that have appeared in the last few days. Will Europe be able to stand on its own feet? After the INF Treaty the quantity of conventional weapons will have to be raised. That is the headline for an article in NEWSWEEK, dated 7 December. Another weekly, British this time, DEFENCE WEEKLY, publishes detailed material about the Soviet nuclear doctrine. The article is long, but it starts with a highly provocative phrase, I would say. I quote: At first glance, the Soviet call for the elimination of medium-range missiles and other classes of nuclear weapons seems to reflect a genuine desire for substantial disarmament. In other words, the author of the article, a certain Yossef Bodansky, casts doubt on the sincerity of our country's intentions as it calls not only for arms control [kontrol] but also for arms elimination. The U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK, which I have already mentioned, with the same provocative aim depicts the scenario for a possible attack by Soviet troops on West Europe. This scenario which the authors themselves called a bad dream, is provided with a diagram of the deployment of the Soviet Armed Forces in West Europe. According to that scenario, as soon as Europe is deprived of the U.S. Nuclear missiles the Soviet Union will immediately commit aggression, cutting it off from the United States, and then Europe, together with its ally, the United States, would have only two solutions left: either to use nuclear weapons, or to surrender at discretion.

Now for another example. This October none other than Henry Kissinger wrote a detailed article about the prospects for the development of East-West relations after the signing of an INF treaty. He reaches the conclusion that the clearing away of nuclear weapons from the European Continent will create advantages for the Warsaw Pact countries that will have to be counterbalanced by conventional weapons.

What is the point of all these articles, all these nonsensical scenarios, the detailed diagrams of attacks by Soviet troops, the fortune-telling from tea-leaves? The forces that are opposed to the policy of detente and that have an interest in maintaining tension and the policy of confrontation are in no mood to give up their positions. They are launching a counteroffensive against the planned process of seeking compromises in the most difficult area of arms control. These conservative forces have already opened fire, to use the expression I read in NEWSWEEK, on the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, the fruitful outcome of which was the signing of the INF Treaty in Washington.

Without even feeling inhibited by the fact that the Soviet leader is currently, in fact, on U.S. soil, the U.S. right-wingers are already forecasting obstacles to the treaty's ratification. They are boasting that they will block the ratification of the treaty in the Senate through a host of amendments and reservations and will drag it out right up to the next planned meeting of the two countries' leaders.

One can, of course, look on these threats in different ways. One may take them into account or igonore them. But one thing is clear: There are still quite a few enemies of a fruitful Soviet-U.S. dialogue left in the United States. There are also quite a few of them in the camp of the Republican Party, which aspires to retain its place in the White House. One of those aspiring to nomination as a presidential candidate, Robert Dole, makes no secret of his noncommittal attitude toward the treaty.

Needless to say, none of this helps to strengthen the generally favourable climate around the first step along the road toward disarmament. But what is comforting is something else, more important: People in the United States have started to realize increasingly clearly that new thinking is required, as well as a fundamentally new approach toward all bilateral and international problems.

Patriarch Pimen Comments

LD092242 Moscow TASS International Servi in Russian 1333 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 9 Dec (TASS)—In connection with the signing in Washington of the treaty on elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia told your TASS correspondent:

"We Christians living in the Soviet Union, like our fellow believers in the United States, prayed in our temples last Sunday for the success of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. Today we thank the Lord for the blessing he has bestowed upon people."

"A treaty on eliminating what are called two classes of missiles has been signed in Washington," the patriarch said. "This is an epoch-making event. One can affirm that it has been motivated by great wisdom. Although the quantities of missiles intended for destruction make up a very small part of the terrifying nuclear weapons that have been built up since the World War II, the decision that they should disappear from the face of the earth is of immense importance. For this should be a good start to the purging of the earth of the nuclear evil."

"We would like to believe that the path toward further peace-making achievements is opening up before the human race," Patriarch Pimen continued. "Ahead of us gleams the hope that in the near future treaties will be concluded not only between the United States and USSR, but between all nuclear powers on the total elimination of nuclear weapons—a very great threat to the existence of the sacred gift of life on earth."

"I would like to repeat the words which I addressed to the congregation which came to pray at the Moscow Church of the Epiphany, to all believers of the Russian Orthodox Church and to Christians of the United States of America. We Christians of both countries bear particular responsibility for the strengthening of trust between our peoples and for the development of good further cooperation between them.

Thus, let us intensify our prayers and redouble our work in order that the third millenium since the coming into the world of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the festival of whose birth we shall shortly be celebrating, be met by mankind on an earth free of nuclear weapons, under a peaceful firmament.

I am certain that other churches, with which we have worked for many years in the field of peace-making, will meet with ardent sympathy the deed that has been accomplished, which the world and all people have so long awaited. The words of the prophet shall come to pass: 'And their swords shall be beaten into plowshares' (Is. 2,4)." [quotemarks as received]

'New Era May Be Dawning'

PM091401 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Special correspondents A. Blinov, L. Koryavin, and A. Shalnev dispatch: "Time of Hope"]

[Text] Washington—The central event of the program of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Washington on 8 December is the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination

of medium- and shorter-range missiles. This treaty carries the peoples' hopes that a new era may be dawning in the nuclear age—one not to the detriment of man but to his benefit.

As traditionally happens in America, every major event is fed into the opinion poll machinery, which produces the appropriate figures on the state of public opinion. They are not all-embracing, but they do provide a picture of the Americans' reaction.

The main event—the signing of the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles—has been in recent days the subject of a kind of referendum, which has passed a vote of confidence in it. Analytical polls, remarks by public organizations and individuals, and finally the meetings and conversations which we journalists have had show that the majority of Americans welcome the treaty.

The path to that treaty was difficult. It has taken years of hard work to overcome the ideas implanted in Americans' minds of nuclear military force as the "guarantee" of the maintenance of peace. After all, for a long time many people in the United States either did not know about or had no real information on the Soviet Union and its aims and intentions. Geneva and Reykjavik, it seems, revealed much to the Americans. Let us add to that our peace initiatives and the long Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. All this began to change the conventional stereotypes.

Meetings, conversations, interviews... We have had a good many in the past few days... Bernard Lown, cochairman of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, said:

"This is a big day for us. The goal which the advocates of nuclear disarmament have set themselves is beginning to be realized. Instead of confrontation there is dialogue. Whole classes of nuclear weapons are being eliminated. It is reassuring! But I believe that it is too early for celebration. Weapons are still being created, including nuclear weapons. The existing arsenals are enormous in scale. For that reason we must move forward from this good start to the next stages of disarmament. Nuclear tests must be stopped too. The present day gives us new incentives. But we must not forget the lessons of the past or cease working for the complete banning of nuclear weapons."

MIT is one of America's leading higher education institutions. It carries out fundamental research in the nuclear sphere and studies space problems. We talked with physics Professor Philip Morrison and Dr Kosta Tsipes—specialists in space exploration.

"This is a good beginning on the path of nuclear disarmament," P. Morrison said. "It is like a breath of spring after the long cold of distrust and alienation. For the first time in the nuclear age, which has already lasted more than 40 years, there is a possibility of averting the nuclear threat from mankind and using the colossal strength and energy of the atom to serve the interests and the good of man—and man alone! Not destruction but creation—that should be our watchword."

Dr Tsipes shares his colleague's viewpoint.

"This is a necessary stage," he said, "in the vitally important process of disarmament. The first stage must be followed by others, and it is necessary in the foreseeable future to begin the elimination of arsenals of strategic nuclear weapons. This opportunity must not be missed. Especially as even before the signing of the medium- and shorter-range missile treaty we already had certain experience, 'valuable research,' as scientists say, showing the real possibility of useful dialogue and a fruitful end result."

When asked for his views on the "Star Wars" question, Dr Tsipes replied:

"I see no future in this venture. It is a doomed idea which is already collapsing both from the scientific and technical viewpoint and from the political viewpoint. It offers no basis for a secure world. The subsequent stages of disarmament and the elimination of the nuclear arsenals, particularly strategic missiles and warheads, provide a real opportunity for achieving that aim."

The U.S. military "elite" and circles of the military-industrial complex remain opponents of the disarmament process. They believe that the multibillion-dollar military programs should not be reversed. But even among the U.S. military, particularly those who underwent the grim school of World War II, there are quite a few people who hold sensible opinions. Rear Admiral Eugene Larocque commanded a destroyer and took part in 13 major sea battles during the war against fascism. He said:

"We often hear the question: Does the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles benefit the United States? It does! As a military man, I can confirm that. The view that Europe is being deprived of its 'nuclear shield' is wrong. There are more than enough armaments left over. Instead, what is being eliminated are classes of missiles which actually present a danger to the European Continent. The present treaty is a step in the right direction. With all its forms of verification and monitoring it may become a practical model for subsequent treaties and for such an important agreement as the elimination of strategic offensive armaments."

Although the reaction in the U.S. Congress to the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles remains to a certain extent mixed, nevertheless even there the scales are tipping in its favor. Many legislators view with optimism the upcoming important process of the Senate's ratification of this international agreement. After M.S. Gorbachev's arrival in Washington, the

IZVESTIYA correspondents' center received a phone call from the office of Senator David Pryor. More than 30,000 letters have been received from schoolchildren in his home state of Arkansas welcoming the Soviet leader's arrival in the United States and expressing much gratitude to him for his efforts to preserve peace.

We asked Senator Pryor to give us his impressions of the day's main event.

"Today," he said, "we witnessed a historic event. I should like to emphasize the special atmosphere which is noticeable in Washington now. We are taking the right step. What will happen next? This is the logical question. It is gratifying that we have an opportunity to receive positive answers to it. Strategic arms, chemical and conventional weapons—they are next. The path is open. Let us take it with a full sense of responsibility and reason."

The new treaty, like the general process of the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations, has its supporters in the United States, but it also has quite a few opponents left. They have become particularly active in recent days. They come in various forms. By the Vietnam Memorial a man called Paddy Stains, who was wearing a Rangers' camouflage jacket, said to one of us: "I would never have signed a treaty with the Russians. Reagan showed weakness. You have only one aim—to destroy us with your missiles." But there is also the subtle politician! The one who seems to support the treaty but really wants to divert it into a maze of legislative casuistry, smothering it with "amendments" and neutralizing the essence of the document so as subsequently to shelve it completely. Finally, there is the placard-waving fanatic who believes that he comes first and the fate of the rest of mankind comes after.

The range of their actions is extensive, the noisy machinery of marches, seminars, and news conferences has been set in motion, and covert means of influence are being used to obstruct the treaty's future progress, but the main thing is to prevent the possibility of the development of a general disarmament process.

Washington has become a real mecca for journalists these days. The Marriott Hotel, which houses the press center, echoes with the sound of many languages. We sought the opinion of Don Oberdorfer, one of the "patriarchs" of U.S. international affairs journalism, who replied: "I have covered most summits but I cannot recall such a scale or interest in the events. The main element of the present meeting is the fact that it offers possibilities and prospects. I have called my article: 'New Era Possible in Relations Between the United States and the USSR.' The summit and the arms reduction may lead to larger-scale improvements in mutual relations between our two countries."

The East Room of the White House, where the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles is being signed, is the one that journalists know best. It is there that the regular presidential news conferences are usually held. But those present are recording in notes and photographs a special news event. The news event of the epoch. Perhaps the beginning of the historic process of nuclear disarmament.

New Proposals Discussed

PM091605 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Vladimir Kuzar telephone report: "Act of Historic Significance"]

[Text] Washington, 8 Dec—The official visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States of America has begun. In his statement at Washington's Andrews airport the Soviet leader stressed that the Soviet Union sincerely desires to improve relations with the United States. We favor constructive dialogue, he said. U.S. President R. Reagan spoke a little earlier at the Christmas tree lighting ceremony in the White House. He also expressed hope for the success of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

These two brief speeches were, as it were, the prelude to the dialogue which has already begun between the two countries' leaders. The ceremony where M.S. Gorbachev officially met R. Reagan took place on the South Lawn of the White House. Then at 1330 local time the official USSR and U.S. delegations and also representatives of the mass media and visitors assembled in the East Room of the White House. Here the signing ceremony of the Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and U.S. Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles took place—the first treaty in history on the physical destruction of two classes of nuclear arms at the same time. These weapons are being destroyed not by virtue of their age or obsolescence but because they are too dangerous for the fate of the planet. Thus, the movement toward a nonnuclear secure world, which was begun in Geneva and then received a powerful fillip in Reykjavik, has now been given material embodiment.

Here, outside the White House, I held a mini-interview with journalists assembled here to mark the historic act of the signing of the Treaty on Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. "The peoples of the whole world have been waiting for such an agreement for a long time. Nuclear weapons must be destroyed," F. Roman, correspondent for France's LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR, said. "Socialist countries support the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. It will not only lead to the elimination of two types of nuclear armaments, but also boosts our common security"—this is the opinion of M. Gremmer, a journalist from the GDR.

Other representatives of the mass media, including U.S. representatives, voiced these thoughts and also the wish to proceed further on questions of nuclear disarmament. However, it is well-known that there are also vehement opponents to this process here. The day before several U.S. television companies broadcast speeches by former U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and his former adviser R. Perle. Both spoke outright in unison about their categorical nonacceptance of the Treaty on Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Naturally, today neither they nor their confederates express the leading trend in world development. But we must not fail to take into consideration their position and we must not underestimate it. The peoples of the planet must always be on the alert and be ready at any moment to deal a resolute rebuff to the provocative intrigues of the forces of reaction and militarism.

All people of goodwill expect that the historic Treaty on Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles which has just been signed in Washington will also have a positive effect on progress on the key question of Soviet-U.S. relations—the reduction of strategic offensive arms and the prohibition of their transfer into space. The urgency of a solution to this problem is obvious. It is strategic offensive means which today make up approximately 96% of both countries' nuclear arsenals. These armaments are nonetheless continuing to be perfected and supplemented by new types. The U.S. desire to implement the SDI program in contravention of the ABM Treaty is fraught with the threat of moving weapons into near-earth space which will make the arms race irreversible and unpredictable.

The Soviet Union resolutely advocates the reduction of strategic offensive arms on the condition that there is no withdrawal from the ABM Treaty for an agreed upon period. Our country intends to demonstrate its constructive consistent policy at the Soviet-U.S. summit. Local observers even voice the opinion that new proposals may be expected from the Soviet delegation on the problem of a reduction in strategic offensive armaments and the nonmilitarization of space. The USSR is always prepared to seek the necessary solutions on a reciprocal basis and to take into consideration and observe the balance of interests.

Thus, the third meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan has begun. The peoples of the planet see this act as a good omen. An omen that the process of nuclear disarmament be irreversible and that a nonnuclear and secure world will be built.

Memorandum, Protocols to Treaty

PM091551 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general heading "Signing of the Treaty on Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles"—passages in boldface as published]

[Text] Washington, 8 Dec—Simultaneously with the signing of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of their medium- and shorter-range missiles in Washington on 8 December this year, M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan signed the following documents appended to the treaty as an integral part of it: Memorandum of Understanding on the Definition of Initial Data in Connection with the Treaty, Protocol on Procedures Regulating the Elimination of Missile Means Within the Scope of the Treaty, and Protocol on Inspections in Connection with the Treaty. Memorandum of Understanding on the Definition of Initial Data in Connection with the Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Medium- and Shorter-range Missiles [subhead]

The Memorandum cites data supplied by the Parties in relation to the medium- and shorter-range missiles and launch installations for such missiles in their possession and also the auxiliary structures and auxiliary equipment connected with such missiles and launch installations.

Elimination will apply, on the Soviet side, to 826 deployed and nondeployed medium-range missiles, including 470 deployed medium-range missiles; on the U.S. side, to 689 medium-range missiles including 429 deployed missiles.

As regards shorter-range missiles, the Soviet side will eliminate 926 deployed and nondeployed missiles, and the U.S. side 170 such missiles.

The various data included in the memorandum apply to approximately 100 facilities on the Soviet side and over 30 facilities located in the United States and on the territory of five West European host countries. It is well-known that Soviet medium-range missiles are deployed exclusively on USSR territory and the U.S. means—on the territories of U.S. NATO allies: the FRG, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

The document names the deployment areas and missile operations bases, defines their precise geographical location, and cites data on the number of medium-range missiles deployed at these facilities, launch installations for such missiles, and auxiliary structures and auxiliary equipment connected with such missiles and launch installations.

Detailed data are given also for the Parties' deployed and nondeployed shorter-range missiles, launch installations for such missiles, and auxiliary equipment connected with such missiles and launch installations. Specific mention is made of Soviet shorter-range missiles deployed and nondeployed on USSR territory, Soviet shorter-range missiles deployed in the GDR and the CSSR, and U.S. shorter-range missiles stored on U.S. territory. Data are given regarding sites for the storage and maintenance of missiles and launch installations, training sites, and sites for elimination.

Soviet and U.S. plants manufacturing medium- and shorter-range missiles and their launch installations are identified, as is the precise geographical location of these enterprises.

The USSR has four such plants, the United States, five. Permanent observation will apply to the plants for the production of ballistic medium-range missiles in the cities of Votkinsk (USSR) and Magna (United States), while monitoring [kontrol] on a periodical basis within the framework of quota inspections for the nonproduction of launch installations for ballistic missiles and ground-based cruise missiles will take place in the USSR at plants in the cities of Volgograd, Petropavlovsk, and Sverdlovsk, and in the United States at plants in the cities of Middle River and San Diego. The remaining plants (for the production of missiles) listed in the Memorandum will not be inspected.

A special section of the Memorandum is devoted to technical data on medium- and shorter-range missiles and auxiliary structures and auxiliary equipment connected with such missiles and launch installations (size, weight, and so on).

Appended to the Memorandum are photographs of missiles, launch installations, auxiliary structures, and auxiliary equipment subject to elimination and plans of the facilities subject to inspection. Protocol on Procedures Governing the Elimination of Missile Means Within the Scope of the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles [subhead]

The protocol on elimination procedures specifically defines the elements of missile means subject to destruction and the procedure and methods of eliminating missiles, launch installations, and auxiliary equipment and structures connected with them.

Medium-range missiles are subject to elimination within 3 years in two stages, the first of which will last 29 months. This process will begin simultaneously for both the USSR and the United States. The United States will reduce all types of missiles on a proportional basis so as to maintain the initial proportion between ballistic missiles and ground-launched cruise missiles being destroyed. Shorter-range missiles will be destroyed within 18 months.

Together with the missiles, their warheads will also be subject to elimination, including 72 U.S. warheads meant for West German "Pershing 1-A" missiles.

The protocol envisages detonation or incineration as methods for elimination of missiles, as well as the launch method for an agreed upon quantity of medium-range missiles. The casing of the missile's nose section will be crushed in a press, the nuclear charge will be handed over for utilization.

Launch installations and auxiliary equipment will be eliminated by being rendered incapable of being used as combat equipment. Former mobile launch installations and transport means (tractors) are allowed to be utilized in the national economy.

Sites specifically agreed upon by the Parties are nominated for the elimination of missile means. There will be eight of them in the Soviet Union and two in the United States.

Thus, the Protocol on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles contains exhaustive information on how the process of their destruction will be implemented. Protocol on Inspections in Connection With the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States of America on the Elimination of their Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles [subhead]

The protocol on inspections contains provisions ensuring effectiveness of verification of the observance of the Treaty for the duration of the period of elimination of medium-range missiles (in other words 3 years) and shorter-range missiles (for 1 and 1/2 years) and for the following 10 years.

Verification of observance of the Treaty's provisions will be implemented in accordance with Article XI of the Treaty (on inspections), the Protocol on Inspections, and the Protocol on Elimination. An important part will be assigned to national technical means of verification.

Provision is made for on-site inspections on the territories of the USSR and the United States and on the territories of countries where missiles subject to elimination are sited: the GDR and the CSSR on the one hand, and the FRG, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands on the other.

The total number of inspections which the USSR will be able to conduct on the territory of the United States and West European countries will be a total of about 240 during the 13 years of the verification mechanism's operation; the United States will be able to conduct a total of about 400 inspections in the USSR, the CSSR, and the GDR.

The following types of inspection are envisaged:

Inspections to verify [proverka] initial data. They will begin 30 days after the Treaty comes into force and will be completed no later than 90 days thereafter.

Inspections to confirm the fact of elimination of missile operations bases and missile auxiliary facilities (excluding missile production facilities). These inspections will be conducted over 3 years, in other words during the period of elimination of the medium- and shorter-range missiles.

Inspections for the nonproduction of missiles at manufacturing plants (one for each party) will be implemented by means of permanent checkpoint observation of the absence of missile manufacture, and, for the nonproduction of launch installations for ballistic and cruise missiles—within the framework of quota inspections.

Inspections of the sites for the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, launch installations for such missiles, and auxiliary equipment connected with such missiles and equipment.

Inspections on a quota basis will be carried out for 13 years at all missile operations bases and missile auxiliary facilities (excluding missile production facilities). The USSR and the United States are entitled to conduct 20 such inspections a year during the first 3 years after the Treaty comes into force, and 15 and 10 such inspections a year respectively during the subsequent first and second 5-year periods.

The protocol contains common commitments by the Parties concerning the procedure for transmitting notification of intention to carry out an inspection, the commitments of the inspecting and inspected Parties in connection with such notifications, the procedure for the entry, reception, and transportation of inspectors to the inspection site, including procedure for the use of monitoring [kontrolnyy] apparatus, common rules for the conduct of inspections, and so on.

Appended to the protocol are regulations on the privileges and immunities of inspectors and flight crew members.

The procedure for the conduct of inspections on the territory of host countries will be determined by agreements with them applying the corresponding Soviet-U.S. understandings on the question of inspections.

Treaty, Verification Outlined

PM101035 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Undated Washington dispatch by special correspondents N. Yefimov and S. Kondrashov: "A Success for Today, an Example for the Future. What the Treaty Signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan Envisages"; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Thanks to satellite telecommunications the entire world yesterday witnessed the ceremony of the signing of the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the first agreement in history on the elimination of nuclear arms. The entire world was a witness of and participant in an event which the peoples of the world had been impatiently awaiting. The text of the treaty is published in today's IZVESTIYA. To make it easier for readers to sort out what it contains we offer an article by our special correspondents describing the main articles and provisions of the treaty signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan on 8 December.

So, the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-range Nuclear Missiles has been signed. The first treaty in history leading to the physical destruction of two classes of nuclear missiles at once.

It is a huge document. The treaty consists of a preamble and 17 articles. Three other documents—a Memorandum of Understanding on the Establishment of Initial Data in Connection with the Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, a Protocol on Procedures Governing the Elimination of Missile Systems [sredstva] Falling Within the Scope of the Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, and a Protocol on Inspections in Connection With the Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles—form an integral part, requiring ratification, of the treaty. A total of over 200 pages. It constitutes an entire book or, for comparison purposes, around 10 newspaper pages. How Much and What Is Being Eliminated [subhead]

The class of medium-range missiles includes all missiles with a range between 1,000 and 5,500 km, while the class of shorter-range missiles includes all missiles with a range between 500 and 1,000 km. In the USSR this category covers SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles, ground-launched cruise missiles, and SS-12 and SS-23 short-range missiles; in the United States it covers missiles of the Pershing-2, BGM-109G, and Pershing-1A types. Thus, all missiles with a range of between 500 and 5,500 km are being eliminated. Each side will retain only a nominal number of both types of missiles and launchers—no more than 15—for... museum requirements; yes, for museums and exhibitions, but they will be rendered noncombat-capable and unusable.

The USSR is destroying in total around 2,000 missiles in the two classes—both deployed and stockpiled—while the United States is destroying around 850. As for nuclear warheads, we are eliminating around 2,500 and the United States, 1,320.

And one other statistic: 826 medium-range missiles in the USSR and 689 in the United States are subject to elimination. The Timetable for Elimination [subhead]

All medium-range missiles must be eliminated in 3 years.

The first, most protracted stage will take 29 months. By the end of that stage reduction will have taken place in such a way that the sides will have, respectively, no more

than 180 and 171 warheads on deployed medium-range missiles and launchers. All remaining medium-range missiles will be eliminated during the second stage—7 months.

Shorter-range missiles are to be eliminated in 1 and 1/2 years, with the specification that the one-time stumbling block at the talks—the U.S. nuclear warheads on the Pershing-1A's belonging to the FRG—will be destroyed in the last 2 weeks of the aforementioned 3-year period.

The USSR and the United States are assuming a commitment not to produce or test any more any missiles with a range of up to 5,500 km. Methods for Eliminating the Missiles [subhead]

The two sides have different methods. The Americans have chosen the method of incinerating the solid fuel and crushing the rest in a press. We will blow up the missiles with conventional explosive in bundles of three or four. Both the USSR and the United States also have the right to destroy missiles by launching them or shooting them down [otstrel] (no more than 100 missiles) within the borders of their national territory and under verification by the other side. The USSR will destroy the missiles and all the necessary equipment relating to them at eight sites. The United States will do it at two sites.

As of 1 November 1987 the sides had exchanged all initial data on the weapons subject to destruction under the treaty.

Within 30 days of the treaty being ratified and coming into force, the two sides will again exchange initial data, which could have changed in the interim, and will subsequently "synchronize their watches" every 6 months.

One side must give the other 30 days' notice of the date of elimination, deployment area, and operations base—that is, the launch positions—and 10 days' notice of the date of destruction by shooting down. Each object must be eliminated within 60 days of the declared start of the elimination.

The USSR and the United States will exchange their timetables for fulfilling the terms of the treaty through the nuclear risk reduction centers; an agreement to create these was signed some months ago.

As for the nuclear warheads, they are removed from the missiles, and the fissile, fissionable material is removed from them. The two sides will use this material as they wish. After appropriate processing this material can be utilized in nuclear power stations. How Verification Will Be Carried Out [subhead]

Even in the new field of eliminating nuclear weapons this is the most innovative part, testifying how far the sides have moved in the direction of each other's position and common interests. The treaty is distinguished by an inspection and verification system which has been elaborated in depth. It involves not only the verification of elimination but also so-called inspections on suspicion and inspection of production. The monitoring regime is extremely strict, the strictest in the entire history of arms control. To a considerable extent it could also be extended in the future to a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, progress toward which is the main substance of the summit.

Inspections will be carried out on the territory of the USSR and the United States and also on the territory of their allies where medium- and shorter-range missiles are situated—the GDR and the CSSR and Belgium, Britain, the Netherlands, Italy, and the FRG. The treaty thus embraces nine countries. All the allies—both ours and the United States'—have given their agreement to verification being carried out. In Reykjavik M.S. Gorbachev said: "...As we are getting into the concrete stage of eliminating nuclear weapons, there must be complete clarity about verification. Verification must now be tightened up. The Soviet Union advocates triple verification."

It can be said that the treaty makes provision for not even triple but quintuple verification, if you take the number of the main types of verification. Let us briefly describe each of them.

1. Inspections to verify initial data. These will begin within 30 days and be completed within 90 days of the ratification of the treaty. All missile operations bases (launch positions) and all auxiliary facilities, with the exception of missile production facilities—that is, plants—are subject to this inspection.

2. Inspections to confirm instances of the elimination of missile operations bases and missile auxiliary facilities. The two sides will carry out these inspections throughout the 3-year period.

3. Inspections on suspicion (inspections on a quota basis). These will be carried at all missile operations bases and auxiliary facilities for 13 years from the moment that the treaty comes into force. In other words, a quota of these annual inspections has been approved for a further 10 years after all the medium- and shorter-range missiles have been destroyed. In the first 3-year period there are 20 inspections for each side per year. This will be followed by 15 inspections in the subsequent 5-year period and 10 in the last 5-year period. Annually, we repeat. The sites and facilities recorded in the Memorandum are subject to monitoring.

4. Inspections for the nonproduction of missiles at the exits of manufacturing plants. These inspections will also operate for 13 years, but on a permanent basis. Posts for inspectors sent by the other side will be set up around the perimeter of the plant. Output can be moved out of the plant territory only through three checkpoints where it

will be subject to monitoring [kontrol]. In the USSR the plant at Votkinsk (Udmurtiya) and in the United States the plant in the city of Magna (Utah) are subject to such monitoring [proverka].

Since different missiles come from the same enterprise, the inspectors can open any containers and make measurements, weigh the output, and even utilize X-ray apparatus to convince themselves that this is not an item prohibited by the treaty.

5. Inspections at sites where missiles are eliminated (including sites where missiles will be destroyed by shooting them down) and sites for the elimination of launchers and auxiliary equipment. These inspections [proverki] will last for 3 years, with inspectors present at the sites where missiles are being eliminated (we repeat, we have eight and the United States has two). They will operate on a permanent basis.

Provision has been made for each side to have 200 inspectors for all types of monitoring and 200 flight crew members, to whom visa-less status is extended; and the points of entry for inspectors in the USSR (Moscow and Irkutsk), in the United States (Washington and San Francisco), and in the countries allied to them have been defined.

A few words about inspection on suspicion. All requests conveying an intention to carry out an inspection on suspicion are made through the nuclear risk reduction centers. A response is to be given within an hour. After this the group of inspectors must arrive at the entry point within 16 hours. The site to be inspected is to be indicated not less than 4 hours and not more than 24 hours after the inspectors arrive at the entry point. They will arrive on their own aircraft, but thereafter the side being inspected provides them with transport and everything necessary. The time for carrying out an inspection on suspicion is not in excess of 24 hours, but it can be extended by a further 8 hours if both sides agree.

Finally, a last detail of fundamental importance. To carry out verification and resolve mutual complaints [pretenziya] a Soviet-U.S. Special Verification Commission is being created; as you can imagine, it will have quite a lot of work to do. A Demonstration of the New Thinking [subhead]

Briefly—or not so briefly—that is the content of the treaty. We have allowed ourselves to cite many of its details in order to show incontrovertibly that this is an unprecedented treaty which neither the USSR and the United States nor any other countries have ever before formulated or ever before signed. Past Soviet-U.S. relations [otnosheniya] have pursued the objective of limiting the arms race by setting quantitative and qualitative limits for given classes of nuclear weapons. We do not intend to underestimate those agreements; on the contrary we pay due triubute to them: They have served and do serve a useful purpose, despite having had a difficult time. But their frameworks were narrow, and they did not prohibit the modernization or improvement of arms and usually did not prevent the emergence of new and even more dangerous and destabilizing means of mass destruction.

The treaty which has just been signed pursues a fundamentally different objective—the elimination (complete elimination) of two classes of nuclear arms at the same time. And not because they have become outdated or need replacing, but because they intensify destabilization in Europe. In terms of destructive potential 200 World War II's lie slumbering in their warheads. Another 200 wars for the continent where both world wars began.

Thus, we have not simply a different objective but a completely new approach to the problem of nuclear disarmament—and, we hope, not only nuclear disarmament. The same radical approach can obviously also be taken to the fate of, for example, chemical and a number of other types of weapons. A treaty created on principles of this kind opens up or—to be more precise and cautious—can open up great positive opportunities in mutual relations between the USSR and the United States. This is veritably a demonstration of the new thinking and an abandonment of many stereotypes and notions which even recently seemed completely immutable both to us and to the Americans.

It is well-known that the birthpangs of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles were agonizing and the path to it was a long one. It was difficult for both countries. They were seeking difficult solutions to difficult questions.

Soon, if the treaty is ratified, extremely unusual inspectors will begin operating in our Votkinsk and the U.S. city of Magna. The Americans will be monitoring what missiles are moved out of our plant, while Soviet inspectors monitor what comes out of the American plant and, as has already been mentioned, X-raying, measuring, and weighing will be carried out if necessary. Their work will undoubtedly require concentration and maximum attentiveness. But more responsibility and scrupulousness, not less—not to mention persistence—was required of the experts who prepared the text of the treaty. Both we and the Americans had to make concessions. This is understandable. Behind each concession and each detail of the future agreement lay no more and no less than considerations of the security of the two powers and their allies. Figuratively speaking, each such detail was X-rayed, weighed, and measured by both sides many times over. Balance of Interests [subhead]

Indeed, many stereotypes and obsolete notions have to be abandoned in an age requiring that security be safeguarded not so much by military as by political means. Sensitive questions relating to arms require more openness [glasnost] and more goodwill. They pay dividends. We will not hide the fact that the authors of these lines

themselves felt some astonishment on familiarizing ourselves with the nuances of verification [proverki] and inspections because everything is so unusual and so bold. Readers will probably ask: Are we not going too far, are we not making too many concessions? We are going no farther than the other side. The inspection will indeed be profound and penetrating, but both we and the Americans have the right to be confident that everything is being honestly fulfilled, that there are no loose ends, that there will be no grounds for one side to complain about the other. This is extremely necessary for both sides.

And another thing. The treaty takes strict account of a balance of interests—not an arithmetic balance of forces, we stress, but a more complex and important balance of mutual interests. Including intrerests relating to our security, which is threatened by U.S. missiles only 6-8 minutes' flight time away from key centers of our country.

Will the newly signed treaty become a protoype for a long-term historic change for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations? This question is now coming to the fore. It is being decided in part at this time at the Washington summit, which is discussing the question of a 50% reduction in the main nuclear arms known to us all as strategic and offensive arms.

Gorbachev's Popularity Noted

LD092230 Moscow Tass in English 2219 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 9 TASS—The tireless efforts of the Soviet Union in campaigning for an end to the arms race, a sincere and open style of the Soviet foreign policy and truly revolutionary changes inside the country lead to a steady rise in the prestige of the leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state among the public of major Western countries. This is corroborated by the results of a public opinion poll conducted by the NBC TV company in the USA, Britain, France and the FRG on the eve of the Soviet-American summit.

Asked about their opinion of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, 53 per cent of polled Americans replied that they had developed favourable opinion of him. The figure for Britons stood at 68, for West Germans—at 59 and for the French—at 39.

U.S. President Reagan won favourable opinion among 59 per cent Americans, 31 percent Britons, 39 per cent West Germans and 37 per cent Frenchmen.

The poll showed that only among his countrymen President Ronald Reagan enjoyed somewhat greater confidence as compared with Mikhail Gorbachev. The relative majority of the polled in Western Europe trusts more the Soviet leader.

U.S. Public Interest Cited

PM091344 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev, T. Kolesnichenko, V. Sukhoy under the rubric "The Summit Meeting: Give Peace a Chance": "'A New Era Is Possible'"]

[Text] Washington, 8 Dec—Here in America, news usually lasts for a day, or even less. But people come back to this event again and again: All the television channels are showing pictures of the arrival of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the United States. It is already known that through television, more than 100 million Americans witnessed the meeting at Andrews Air Base and listened to the Soviet leader's statement, transmitted over the air. On behalf of the Soviet people, he greeted the American people and conveyed to them wishes for prosperity and peace.

There is tremendous interest in the visit. Representatives of the press converged here from more than 100 countries to record this historic event. The goodwill which Americans are showing to the Soviet guest is touching. Many Washington homes carry striking homemade posters: "Gorbachev: Welcome to America!"

Today in Washington is the 1st day of talks between President R. Reagan and M.S. Gorbachev. The high point of the day was undoubtedly the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

...It is 1345 hours Washington time. The East Room of the White House is a spacious room in white and gold tones. Dozens of cameras are pointed at the participants in the ceremony, ready to record this historic moment.

The signing ceremony did not last long, but how long people had been waiting for this day!

The elimination of an entire class of nuclear arms is an unprecedented phenomenon. Although as yet it is only a question of a 4% reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the USSR and the United States, this step promotes the strengthening of universal security on the planet and lessens the European peoples' fear of nuclear catastrophe.

The treaty that was signed is a lengthy document. Together with the appendices, there are about 200 pages. But what matters is, of course, not the number of pages, but the content. The point is that this is the first time in history that such an agreement—on the destruction of the most modern nuclear weapon systems—has been concluded.

How did such an agreement become possible? After all, the present administration at one time proclaimed an entirely different course—one of open confrontation, the

arms race, the attainment of military superiority over our country... Today is the time to remember Geneva, Reykjavik, the heat of the antimissile, antinuclear struggle on various continents. The new thinking which forms the basis of Soviet foreign policy today could not fail to make itself felt. Despite the cynics and skeptics, international development became constructive in nature. A whole series of major peace-loving acts by the USSR followed. The path was opened up to an accord on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles.

In connection with the visit, observers here are reflecting on the prospects that could be opened up as a result of this event. THE WASHINGTON POST, which published 21 items devoted to the Washington meeting in its 7 December issue, begins its first article with these words, for instance: "A new era in relations between the USSR and the United States is possible." "A successful summit meeting could lead to fundamental improvements in relations between the leading countries of East and West," the newspaper goes on. "Major changes in the world arena are also probable." Well, given goodwill by the sides, that turn of events is entirely realistic.

Substantive discussions and concrete results are expected from the meeting. "Like other Americans," R. Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, stated, "I hope that the talks will be successful, they have the opportunity to reduce tension in relations between our countries and take a substantial step in the direction of peace."

No doubt each of the 3 days of the visit will be important in its own way. But one thing is already clear: 8 December 1987 is a special day in the history of the nuclear age, the day that marked the start of a process which hundreds of millions of people on earth would like to make irreversible.

Correction to Gorbachev Arrival Report

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Gorbachev Arrives, 'Improvement' Sought," published in the 8 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 13: Column two, paragraph three, sentence two should read: An unconstrained conversation over... (changing "informal" to "unconstrained")

China

Foreign Ministry Hails Signing of INF Treaty

LD091353 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Beijing December 9 TASS—China hails the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons—intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, a responsible representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry said at a briefing held here today. The signing of this agreement is the first step towards nuclear disarmament. China hopes that the USSR and the USA will continue the negotiations to cut drastically nuclear arsenals.

It was pointed out at the briefing that China was consistently advocating the prohibition and complete destruction of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, considerable cuts in conventional arms, as well as against the spread of the arms race to space.

Treaty Seen To Ease Tension

LD071638 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Beijing December 7 TASS—The CHINA DAILY newspaper today said the projected Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles would be a first practical step in cutting back American and Soviet nuclear arsenals.

In a comment on the forthcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, it said that after being ratified and completely realized, the treaty would definitely ease international tension.

The paper expressed the hope for the Soviet Union and the United States to continue efforts towards an early agreement to scrap other kinds of nuclear weapons as well.

The CHINA DAILY said every effort must be made to prevent the arms race from spilling over into outer space, ban all chemical and biological weapons, and effect sizable cuts in conventional armaments.

Delegation in USSR Discusses Power Cooperation

OW100817 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Excerpts] China's power industry delegation is now visiting our country to discuss the issue of the Soviet Union's taking part in building a big thermal power station in China. Together with Soviet experts they will discuss the designing work and use of Soviet generating set at the Suidong thermal power station. The Suidong thermal power station is one of the seven power stations that the Soviet Union will help China build or upgrade in accordance with an economic and technological cooperation agreement signed by the Soviet Union and China in 1985. Station reporter (Dridriyev) talked with Comrade (Jin Keming), deputy director of the Northeast Power Design Academy of China's Ministry of Water Conservancy and Power, on cooperation of power industry between the Soviet Union and China.

[Begin recording] [(Dridriyev)] The Soviet Union and China have been engaging in a large-scale cooperation in the area of power construction. In the past, I talked with some Chinese comrades who came to our country to discuss the building of power stations. What is the purpose of your present visit to the Soviet Union?

[(Jin Keming)] We are an 18-member delegation. The purpose of our visit is to talk with Soviet Industrial Technology Export Company about coordinating the design of the two 800,000-kwh generating sets for Suidong Power Station. [passage omitted]

[(Dridriyev)] You have been here for several days. What about the progress of the designing work?

[(Jin Keming)] We have worked and coordinated with Soviet comrades on several occasions. This visit, my fourth, is to continue my past work. We work pretty well with Soviet counterparts, and the project is proceeding smoothly.

[(Dridriyev)] Would you please talk about planned activities of your delegation while in our country?

[(Jin Keming)] We are here to coordinate with the comrades of Soviet Academy of Design on designing work. We are also going to visit Soviet manufacturers of main generators and auxiliary generators, as well as the generator plant which is building the 800,000-kwh generators. To have a better understanding of Soviet generator plants, we will visit Tashkent, Leningrad, and (Bild).

[(Dridriyev)] What about your working conditions here?

[(Jin Keming)] Soviet comrades give us a warm reception and take good care of our working and living conditions, which leave us a very beautiful impression. In addition, we find Soviet comrades hardworking, conscientious, and responsible in their work. We really have had a supurb coordination with them.

[(Dridriyev)] What is your view about power cooperation between the Soviet Union and China?

[(Jin Keming)] The Soviet Union has very rich experience in power construction. We too have accumulated much experience over the years. What with China's need for power staions and both countries' experience in power construction, a good foundation for technical exchanges and cooperation between the two countries is thus laid. In the past few years, China and the Soviet Union have proceeded well in cooperation and exchanges in power construction. China is now undergoing power construction projects in Jixian, Yining, Suidong, Yingkou, and Nanjing. With the development of our power construction, there will possibly be other

projects. Therefore, prospects for technological exchanges and cooperation between the two countries on power construction are very bright. [end recording]

USSR Seeks Better Ties in Asia-Pacific Region

OW020337 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Excerpts] Speaking at a Moscow gathering marking the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, Soviet leader Gorbachev touched on many major world issues. He pointed out the need to develop equal and mutually beneficial economic cooperation among nations. [passage omitted]

As an Asia-Pacific nation, the Soviet Union strives to strengthen economic cooperation and relations with all the other nations in the region. Our efforts stem not from an expedient plan but aim at the long-term objective of international labor distribution.

In addition, one of the major goals of the current economic reform is to seek a way for the Soviet Union to establish broader ties with the world economy. The Soviet Union holds that there are now good conditions for developing trade and economic ties with nations of the Asia-Pacific region. [passage omitted]

First of all, the Soviet Union has long been considered a dependable trading partner. [passage omitted] Second, as everyone knows, the big Soviet market offers a limitless future for Asia-Pacific nations in trading with the vast Soviet Far East region along the Pacific coast. Here we would like to recommend a mutually beneficial and convenient border and coastal trading pattern. For example, some Soviet oblasts and cities in the Far East may have direct trade with China, Japan, the DPRK, Vietnam, and regions and cities of other nations. The Soviet Union also suggests that Asia-Pacific nations broaden economic cooperation with it. The Soviet Union is willing to assist nations in the region to develop productive forces and to help solve other economic problems. Our country can take part in designing engineering projects and setting up plants for nations in the region. [passage omitted]

Facts have proved the effectiveness of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the nations in the Asia-Pacific region. For example, in the early 1980s, the Soviet Union helped the People's Republic of Mongolia build 400 projects which laid foundation for its economic construction. [passage omitted]

Agreements have also been reached with the PRC in setting up new or renovating existing enterprises. The Soviet Union technologically helped China renovate and build seven power stations. [passage omitted]

Another promising cooperative area lies in the Soviet Union's ability to provide transport service to nations in the Asia-Pacific region. The Soviet vessels provide cargo service and help set up shipping companies for nations in the region. [passage omitted]

All in all, strengthened ties and coooperation between the Soviet Union and nations in the Asia-Pacific region is in accord with the common interest, and will bring good things for all parties concerned. Without a doubt, it will in a large measure promote the atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust, and contribute to building a peaceful and good-neighborly situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Federov on Okinawa's Role in Pentagon Plans

OW031302 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 3 Dec 87

[Fedorov commentary]

[Text] An announcement was made in Washington that another joint exercise between the U.S. and Japanese Air Forces will be held on Japan's Okinawa Island from 3 to 9 December. Fedorov, a commentator of this station, has the following comments on the event:

The forthcoming air force maneuver, the 12th of this year, will climax U.S.-Japanese military cooperation. There is no indication whatsoever that the cooperation between the U.S. and Japanese Armed Forces will scale down, so a conclusion can be reached that Washington still regards Okinawa as its major military base in the Asia-Pacific region. I think that this issue merits our greatest attention because U.S. military presence in Japan concerns the security of the Soviet Union, China, Vietnam, and other countries.

Dear listeners, I would like to call your attention to Okinawa's role in the Pentagon's plan. U.S. generals will regard Okinawa as a stepping-stone to Southeast Asia if they think that Japan wants to divert military activities onto the Asian Continent. All of us remember what happened not long ago. U.S. Air Force aircraft took off from Kadena and Naha airfields and bombed Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. On Okinawa there were also large transshipment stations that supported U.S. forces' activities in Indochina.

Someone probably will disagree and say that those years are long gone. I don't think so. U.S. military bases at Kadena, Naha, and other locations on Okinawa are still designed to support U.S. activities in the tropical zone of Asia. U.S. Rapid Deployment Forces stationed in Okinawa are specially trained for operations in conditions similar to that of Indochina. U.S. Air Force units based in Okinawa and their Japanese counterparts are carefully studying the air routes to Indochina. U.S. nuclear weapons are stored in ammunition depots in Okinawa, and the Pentagon has asserted that it might use those nuclear weapons in case of emergency.

In view of the tension in the Western Pacific, we may liken the U.S. military presence in Okinawa to a burning match near explosives.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Premier's Policy Speech Assessed

PM081235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov dispatch: "Japan: Premier's Program Speech"]

[Text] Tokyo—An extraordinary parliamentary session is being held in the Japanese capital. It will last through 12 December. Its agenda is quite full and includes a discussion of a number of acute problems facing the country.

Commentators here attach great significance to this session because it will be a kind of debut for the new Japanese cabinet formed by Prime Minister N. Takeshita at the beginning of this month. The last cabinet, headed by Y. Nakasone, has not left the happiest of legacies: Land prices have soared to unprecedented heights, which makes economists talk seriously of a threat of escalating inflation in the country; the yen has increased in value by almost 50% against the dollar, and this has hit hard the leading sectors of the Japanese economy oriented toward exports; conflicts with Japan's leading trade partners, and with the United States above all, have been exacerbated; and questions such as the reform of the tax system, administrative reform, and education reform remain unresolved.

All this baggage lies like a heavy weight on the shoulders of the new Cabinet, which hardly has any time left to swing into action—the present situation demands urgent and specific measures. A program of such measures had been expected in the prime minister's guideline speech, which he made the day the parliamentary session opened. Its contents, however, elicited somewhat disappointed comments from the Japanese mass media.

This reaction is easy to understand. The speech by the Japanese head of government lasted just 24 minutes, during which the problems to be resolved were concisely set forth, the main directions in the cabinet's activity were advanced as theses, and the basic priorities in the new administration's domestic and foreign policy were indicated. However, not a word was said about how and by what means to achieve the set goals. It was this lack of specificity and the streamlined nature of the formulas that caused the disappointed murmuring.

N. Takeshita's speech is noteworthy, above all, for its continuity with basic assessments and positions of the previous administration. This was expressed particularly insistently in the foreign policy sphere. The strengthening of relations with the United States was defined as the key direction of Japanese foreign policy. The importance of further developing bilateral contacts along the line of "ensuring security" was emphasized as well.

The Japanese prime minister noted the importance of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue and expressed hope for the success of the arms control talks and the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. He pointed out that Japan will give all-around support to the efforts of U.S. diplomacy and thereby contribute to the cause of ensuring peace and establishing stable East-West relations. As for Japanese-Soviet relations, a brief paragraph was devoted to them, defining the resolution of the so-called "territorial question" as the priority goal—a condition for establishing genuine mutual understanding between the two countries.

The parliamentary debate on the prime minister's speech will begin this week, and it promises to be quite stormy.

Idea of Joint U.S.-Japan Command Viewed

PM081539 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[A. Matveyev article under the rubric "Pertinent Notes": The Role of Accomplice"]

[Text] Is there a secret accord currently in force between Washington and Tokyo on creation of a joint U.S.-Japanese military command in the event of an "emergency"? This question is now being widely discussed in the Japanese press. The fact that such an accord was reached in the early fifties follows directly from recently declassified Japanese Foreign Ministry documents. Fearing general indignation at the outright subordination of its "self-defense forces" to the Pentagon, Tokyo at that time refused to include the point about "joint command" in the U.S.-Japanese agreement. Washington, however, was satisfied with secret oral assent.

Japanese officials claim that the accord has now "lost its force." I admit that this is difficult to believe. For instance, ASAHI SHIMBUN believes that the agreement on a U.S.-Japanese command is in force even today. It is no secret that people in the offices of the Pentagon and the National Defense Agency are constantly drawing up plans for joint actions by the two countries' armed forces in the event of an "emergency." Furthermore, U.S. and Japanese ground and air forces, and naval formations, are constantly preparing for joint military operations. Moreover, to judge by the nature of the maneuvers, they also intend to carry out such operations beyond the confines of the Japanese islands.

The just-published book DEFENSE OF THE STRAITS [OBORONA PROLIVOV] illustrates how deeply this dangerous idea has taken root in the heads of the Japanese military and politicians. It has been put together by the Japanese Center for Strategic Research, which has a marked influence on the shaping of the country's foreign and military policies.

The book's main idea is that preparedness to blockade the far eastern international straits is the basis of the defense of the Japanese islands. It can be stressed without a shadow of a doubt that the main purpose of such a blockade is to lock up the Soviet Pacific fleet at its bases and thus give the U.S. Navy room to operate in the Asia-Pacific region.

The book's authors believe that, in order to carry out this operation effectively, it is necessary to create a single control center for the troops not only of the United States and Japan but also those of South Korea.

The prospect of subordinating Japanese "self-defense forces" to U.S. generals and admirals by no means shocks either the analysts from the strategic research center or those whose orders they were executing. On the contrary, they spared no efforts to create a system which ASAHI SHIMBUN defined as a "mechanism for Tokyo's automatic involvement in a war at the Pentagon's command."

Meanwhile, you cannot fail to see that the inspiration for the idea of blockading the straits was drawn from concepts of the so-called "new naval strategy" of the United States. It is precisely this strategy which demands the transformation of the Soviet Union... into an isolated island. Its basis is the gamble on a first strike and on employing nuclear weapons. It is not difficult to imagine what participation in these provocative aggressive schemes may entail for Japan.

Dmitriyev on Japan's Anti-Soviet Acts

OW100958 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Excerpts] Australian Prime Minister Hawke recently visited the Soviet Union. Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev writes:

No one can say that the Soviet Union is an utter newcomer to the South Pacific scene. The history of exchanges between our country and Australia extends for more than a century. Nevertheless, revitalization of Soviet policy in this region in recent years literally created sensations in the West that had traditionally viewed the South Pacific as a U.S. lake. The signing of fishing pacts between the Soviet Union and such island nations as Kiribati and Vanuatu was seen as a threat to security, as if those pacts had involved aircraft carriers, not trawlers.

A look at the world map will show that the Soviet Union is in fact one of the Pacific countries. There is nothing unusual, therefore, about the Soviet aspirations to expand economic and political relations with countries in this region. During his visit to Moscow, Prime Minister Hawke expressed Australia's hopes for fruitful relations with the USSR on all matters in which the two nations have interests. [passage omitted]

On the other hand, however, we cannot afford to ignore another view. For example, during his tour of the South Pacific region early this year, then Foreign Minister Kuranari made considerable efforts to implant among local people feelings of distrust for the Soviet intent. In this connection, NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN wrote that Japan should be more concerned about South Pacific nations' economic development rather than worrying about any increase in Soviet influence in the region, and that it should be the way to promote genuine security.

During the Japan-Australia consultations in late October in Tokyo, however, Japanese authorities again urged prudence about Soviet foreign policy. Should there be any doubt about Soviet foreign policy, it could be dispelled eventually by a study of results gained in the development of exchanges between the Soviet Union and South Pacific nations.

When viewed from the Soviet standpoint, it is more desirable to pursue a common position than an imaginary threat. This is very important in a modern world already replete with practical contradictions.

When General Secretary Gorbachev referred to the Soviet approach to Asian security in his Vladivostok speech in July last year, he did so precisely from this viewpoint. [passage omitted]

Japan Rejects Proposed Science Accord With U.S.

LD092210 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 9 TASS—Tokyo will not accept the U.S. draft for a new bilateral agreement on cooperation in science and technology, Foreign Ministry officials have told the newspaper JAPAN TIMES.

The agreement binds Japan to inform the United States of most promising Japanese technological developments.

The officials said Washington was demanding that Tokyo allow U.S. experts to state laboratories and research institutions of the country's leading private corporations.

The United States insists on making secret those Japanese technological developments which, in U.S. opinion, can be used for military purposes.

Tokyo and Washington have been unable to work out a new agreement on scientific and technological cooperation since April 1985 due to sharp contradictions over the issues.

Delegation Returns From Japanese CP Congress
PM071357 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Delegation Departs"]

[Text] Tokyo, 2 Dec—The CPSU delegation comprising P.N. Fedoseyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and I.I. Kovalenko, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, which had been taking part in the work of the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Japan, left the Japanese capital for Moscow today.

The delegation returned to Moscow the same day.

Journal Reports Story of Japan's CW Island
PM071255 Moscow APN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No 22, Nov 87 pp 4-5

[USSR Ministry of Defense Institute of Military History senior researcher Aleksandr Khrenov article: "What Is Behind the Secret of the Island of Okunoshima?"]

[Text] Since 1938 Japanese maps stopped showing the small island of Okunoshima near the Honshu Island. In that tempestuous period on the eve of the Second World War the disappearance of the island went unnoticed. Details of that incident, shedding light on the causes of the cartographic manipulation, have come to public knowledge only recently.

In 1929, the Japanese started the construction of a complex on the island for the production of chemical weapons. The complex which had operated until the end of the Second World War turned out six types of combat chemicals which were distinguished by colours used as their codenames. For example, Blue stood for phosgene, Brown for hydrocyanic acid, Yellow-2 for lewisite. For the sake of secrecy and invulnerability of the centre, the island was "erased" from the maps.

The chemical explosives produced there were extensively used by Japan in the war against China. They were used on 1,600 occasions against the Chinese Army and peaceful civilians in 81 districts and 13 provinces of the country. Some 37,000 to 50,000 suffered from those chemical attacks. In just one series of battles in 1942 the Japanese troops used chemical weapons 56 times, firing 18,000 shells and bombs containing toxic chemicals.

As it follows from a recently discovered document, a secret directive by the command of the Japanese Imperial Army issued in 1938, Japan had planned to use chemical weapons against the USSR. The directive reads as follows: The military tactic of the Red Army forces us to use chemical weapons from the very start of the hostilities. In view of the Khasan Lake experience, it is essential to carry out preparations of the Japanese Army for offensive operations with the use of combat chemicals.

Facts of the use of chemical weapons by the Japanese are being hushed up today. For example, a special report by an American commission on this issue, which had done an inspection in China and included information on Japanese war criminals in the said report, as well as many of the materials of the hearings at the International War Tribunal in Tokyo have never seen the light.

A special instruction by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of July 24, 1946 read that detailed information that might interest the US was to be reported directly to the Centre. Without the JCS's consent no such information was to be made public.

Despite those strict bans it is known for sure that American troops took part in the dismantling of the equipment of the Japanese chemical arms factories and its partial transfer to the US. The facility for the production of toxic chemicals on the island of Okunoshima was dismantled in 1948. In doing so, the US took out in specially designed tankers 1,845 tons of liquid toxins, 930 tons of gas and 16,300 chemical chells.

The scale on which the Japanese technology has been used in the development of new chemical weapons is a closely guarded secret.

Problems Noted in Soviet, Mongolian Trade
PM071657 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Sapov "Rejoinder": "Being Unctuous... On an Anniversary"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, Dec—Soviet journalists accredited in Mongolia were recently invited to the USSR Trade Mission. Imagine our surprise when G. Budkov, the deputy head of this solid overseas establishment well familiar to us, perplexed those present with his words:

"We are coming up to an anniversary; it would be good to give it broad coverage in the press."

"Now would also be the time to talk about problems," one of us remarked.

But after making casual mention of shortcomings, we were once again strenuously advised on what would be best to write and for which publications. Be daring, we were told; show us in a good light.

Yes, there are grounds for providing information. But why this frank demand for "smarmy words"?!

In the first 6 months of this year, Mongolian-Soviet trade exceeded R760 million. But this indicator conceals a considerable number of serious problems. Reciprocal delivery contracts are not being honored. The Soviet Union's failure to supply certain spare parts, fuels, and lubricants is seriously affecting the work of some enterprises built and operated with Soviet assistance. Border trade is unsystematic. Poor planning, the low standard of commercial work, and inadequate verification by financial bodies and the bank have resulted in economic organizations in the Buryat ASSR and Chita Oblast being greatly in arrears to the Mongolian side. Direct links are only slowly being developed.

The Soviet Trade Mission in Mongolia has been seriously criticized more than once for its bureaucratic work style. G. Budkov admitted from the rostrum:

"We still approach the solution of problems using old criteria and stereotypes, i.e. we have not thoroughly grasped the essence of the current restructuring in foreign economic relations."

True words! The press conference should have opened with them....

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Thai Minister Receives General Ivanovskiy

PM041251 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Talks Held"]

[Text] Bangkok, 3 Dec—Air Chief Marshal Phaniang Kantarat, defense minister of the Kingdom of Thailand, today received Army General Ye. F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who is here on an official visit. Friendly talks were held on questions of mutual interest.

A.I. Valkov, USSR ambassador to Thailand, was present at the meeting.

Further on Hun Sen-Sihanouk Talks in Paris

Communique Issued

LD041434 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] Paris December 4 TASS—TASS correspondent Viktor Khrekov reports.

The first consultative meeting between chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Kampuchea Hun Sen and Prince Norodom Sihanouk has been held in a small town of Fere-en-Tardenois near Paris. Questions of the establishment of peace in Kampuchea in the light of the programme for national reconciliation advanced by the government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea were in the spotlight of attention.

A joint communique was signed on the results of the meeting. It notes great importance of the consultations held and emphasizes that there must be a political solution to the conflict in Kampuchea. The document says that the Kampuchean problem should be resolved by the Kapuchean people itself through talks with the participation of all the parties concerned. The aim of the settlement is an end to hostilities, the construction of peaceful. independent, democratic, sovereign, neutral and nonaligned Kampuchea. After an agreement between the Kapuchean sides is reached, an international conference should be convened to ensure the guarantees of Kampuchea's independence, of peace and stability in South East Asia.

Guided by the supreme interests of the Kampuchean people, the participants in the meeting invite all other Kapuchean sides to sit down at a negotiating table to speed up the process of the settlement, to contribute to turning South East Asia into a zone of peace and stability, the communique says.

Hun Sen and Norodom Sihanouk agreed to hold a new meeting in January, 1988, in France, the the consultations are proposed to be continued in Pyongyang.

Cambodian Beam on Talks

BK061139 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Talks were just held in France between Comrade Hun Sen, head of the PRK Government; and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, a leader of the opposition groups.

According to Comrade Hun Sen, during the meeting the two sides could solve a number of conflicting questions, thus reaching the first step toward solving the complex problem known as the Cambodian problem. Progress was made possible thanks to the far-sighted and prudent policy of the PRK leadership.

Declaring its national reconciliation policy in August this year, the PRK Government has appealed to all Cambodians regardless of their past, class, and ideologies to unite as one man in order to build a free and prosperous society.

The past 3 months following that declaration were marked by the effectiveness of this policy. Many former members of the Cambodian opposition groups taking refuge abroad, including high-ranking officers, have laid down their weapons and crossed over to the side of the

legal government. These returnees have enjoyed equal rights as all other citizens of the Republic and have been allowed to carry out honest work in the service of the fatherland.

A factor which has become an inseparable part of the national reconciliation policy is the decreasing number of the Vietnamese Army volunteers in Cambodia as agreed upon by the governments of the two countries. Public opinion in the region has paid keen interest in the sixth withdrawal of the Vietnamese volunteer units which has just completed. As a result of this withdrawal, the number of the Vietnamese Army volunteers in Cambodia has decreased by another 20,000 men, or twice that of last year's withdrawal. It should be noted that the Vietnamese Government has always made positive immense contribution to rapidly restoring peace in the ancient Land of Angkor. We would like to recall the dialogue that has continued between Vietnam and Indonesia with an aim to bring about an informal talk of all Cambodian forces involved in the conflict. At the end of November, the delegations of the two countries held another meeting in the island resort of Bali in Indonesia. According to those who attended the meeting, progress has been made on many details discussed. Therefore, the situation around Cambodia is becoming clearly stablized. As a proof of this, Thailand has decided to pull its troops back from the border area adjacent to Cambodia. And according to a Bangkok newspaper, THE NATION, this is because there is no military threat from the Vietnamese side.

It is difficult to understand the worrisome and discontented attitude displayed by the leading circles in the Western world at seeing the positive development of the situation in Southeast Asia. A representative of the U.S. State Department, Charles Redman, has said that the Vietnamese troops were not withdrawn, that the withdrawal was just a smokescreen to cover up the replacement of a unit by another. He said that this does not seem to bring about any change.

This shows that it is not accidental that a number of Western countries had turned a deaf ear on the PRK's invitation and refused to send observers to witness the withdrawal of the Vietnamese Army volunteers from Cambodia. The powers in the Western world really do not want to take an optimistic stand regarding the realities. They are unhappy to see that the situation in and around Cambodia is becoming more and more stabilized. Such an attitude of the Western world is futureless.

No one can reverse the process to settle the Cambodian problem through political means. To make this process successful, in the Soviet Union's opinion, it is necessary to broadly apply all measures regarding the peaceful settlement of all conflicts of ideas between states.

The talk between Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk ended with the signing of a joint communique in which the two sides noted that the Cambodian problem should be resolved through peaceful means. This is another proof that such an attitude regarding the settlement of regional conflicts is winning broader support.

Hun Sen Departs From Moscow

LD091505 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—Hun Sen, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, left Moscow for home today.

He made a stopover here on his way from Paris.

Sixth SRV Cambodia Troop Withdrawal Reported

PM041355 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Domogatskikh dispatch "From Kampuchean-Thai Border": "Send-Off in Battambang"]

[Text] Battambang-Phnom Penh—Battambang Province is in northwest Cambodia. Pol Potite formations used its roads in January 1979 to flee the country, leaving behind them enormous destruction and the totally innocent people they had killed. Neither the most brutal terror, nor the policy of genocide, nor outside support saved the Pol Potite criminals from defeat. The Cambodian people, with the fraternal aid of Vietnamese volunteers, overthrew the loathed regime and formed a people's republic.

The young state's successes in developing the economy, effecting social transformations, and strengthening its defense capability enabled the two fraternal states—the PRK and the SRV—to decide in 1983 on the phased withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteer units from Caambodia. On 11 November this year, the SRV Defense Ministry announced the sixth stage of their withdrawal since 1984. More than 100 journalists from 27 countries and a large number of military observers were invited to be present at this ceremony.

We arrived in Battambang Province by plane and helicopter early on the morning of 26 November as light drizzle fell.

"People's Kampuchea has achieved successes not only in its economy but also in strengthening its defense," said Colonel Le Nin Fong [name as published] of the No 94 volunteer troop formation. "Defensive installations have been constructed here in past years and servicemen trained who are capable of repulsing any sudden enemy attacks. This makes the border in Battambang sound and reliable."

Other speakers included: Commander of the Fourth Military District Hul Savoan, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party [KPRP] Central Committee; Ung Sami [name as published], secretary of the Battambang Province party committee and member of the KPRP Central Committee; and representatives of public organizations. Gratitude was expressed for the fraternal aid afforded in the struggle for Cambodia's freedom. Replying, Major General Nguyen Suan Khoa [name as published], commander of the volunteer troop formations, spoke about the inextricable bonds of friendship and cooperation that have welded together the peoples and servicemen of Vietnam and Kampuchea.

Subunits marched beneath unfurled combat banners through the Square of Fallen Fighters in Battambang at the start of their long journey home.

Reaction to Troop Pullout

BK030919 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 2 Dec 87

[Text] A few days ago, the Cambodian people bade farewell to 20,000 Vietnamese volunteer combatants who were being repatriated. These combatants came to assist a fraternal country defend the revolutionary gains, ensure security along the border, and the people's peaceful life. This is the sixth partial troop withdrawal of Vietnamese forces. It coincides with efforts to resolve the Cambodian problem.

On 2 December in Paris, Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, will meet with Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, head of the opposing Cambodian forces. The reduction in the level of Vietnamese forces has attracted great attention among international public opinion. It is considered as a show of good will on the part of the PRK and the SRV, which want to contribute to the normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia.

However, the reduction of Vietnamese forces has displeased power circles in the Western world. Redman, spokesman of the U.S. State Department, said in a recent press conference that this withdrawal of Vietnamese units from Cambodia was just a secret replacement of some Vietnamese units with new ones. Western press agencies also expressed this view. Basing their views on experts' opinions, they babbled that the repatriation of 20,000 soldiers does not make any difference to the situation; the Vietnamese armed forces still remain the only reliable (? force) in Cambodia.

This indifferent reaction to this event [words indistinct] despite the fact that Cambodian leaders have invited foreign representatives, who witnessed with their own eyes the send-off ceremony for the internationalist Vietnamese units. Representatives from over 20 countries agreed to travel to Cambodia. However, most Western countries refused to follow this event because they do not need facts, which not only contradict the stand the United States and its allies have persistently adhered but they also expose the pretext used as the basis for their policies.

It is clear that there are forces in the international arena which benefit from the tense situation around Cambodia. This situation has allowed these forces to interfere in the affairs of countries in the region and use the difference of opinions between the Indochinese countries and the ASEAN states to achieve their criminal goal. Regional stability in Southeast Asia could cause them to lose key bases needed to implement their tricky policies. This is why they want to hinder dialogue between the two groups of countries in the region, pretend to ignore the above event, or remain indifferent to changes in the area.

Statements to the effect that the people's state authorities in Cambodia cannot firmly defend the country's border and sovereignty are all lies. Since the time the Pol Pot clique was expelled from the country, the PRK has consistently worked to strengthen the revolutionary forces. Units [words indistinct] which, at the end of 1978, took part in the struggle of the entire people against the Pol Pot genocidal regime, have become the armed forces which possess high combat capability and good morale; they are well-trained and equipped with the most up-to-date equipment. Vietnam started to pull out its forces from Cambodia in 1982. In the 1984-85 dry season, the Cambodian people's revolutionary forces dealt heavy blows to major positions of the counterrevolutionaries. The people's revolutionary armed forces have launched many operations, most of them independently without the participation of Vietnamese volunteer combatants. The enemies of normalization of the situation in Cambodia through political means have ignored these facts.

Along with this, we note that by closing their eyes to reality and basing their [word indistinct] policy, they have lost the ability to see the viewpoint according to which the situation in Cambodia can be resolved through talks to pave the way [words indistinct] countries, toward peace, progress, and prosperity.

SPK Cites Thai 'Provocations' Against Cambodia

LD031813 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 3 Dec 87

["Continued Thai Provocations Against Kampuchea"—TASS headline]

[Text] Phnom Penh December 3 TASS—In the period from November 18 to 24 Thai Air Force reconnaissance planes repeatedly flew over parts of Kampuchean territory adjoining the border with Thailand, the SPK Kampuchean news agency reports. Thai artillery massively shelled Kampuchean border areas.

During the same period Kampuchean armed forces jointly with Vietnamese volunteers killed or wounded about 200 members of counter-revolutionary groupings who tried to infiltrate Kampuchea from the territory of Thailand with the aim of committing acts of subversion and sabotage. Weapons, including heavy weapons, ammunition and military equipment were seized.

Near East & South Asia

Soviet Diplomat on Troop Withdrawal From DRA

LD091507 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1400 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Paris, December 8 (TANJUG)—Soviet troops are ready,under certain conditions, to withdraw from Afghanistan in "less than 12 months", political advisor at the Soviet Embassy in Paris Aleksandr Orlov today said in an interview to the French TV.

International agreements guaranteeing peace in Afghanistan, non-interference in the country's internal affairs and the creation of conditions for the Afghan people to solve their internal problems by themselves, are the preconditions of a Soviet troop withdrawal, Orlov said.

The Soviet decision to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan "has already been reached in principle", Orlov said, and expressed the conviction that the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington "could play a crucial role" in the matter.

Daily Notes Cruelty of Afghan Rebel Leaders

LD080333 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2235 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 8 Dec (TASS)—The leaders of the counterrevolution headed by Younis Khalis, treated with affection recently at the White House, set against the realities of the reconciliation policy in Afghanistan only unbridled hatred. Again and again they throw into battle gangs of dushmans, taught by foreign advisers in training centers on the territory of Pakistan and Iran and equipped with money from the United States and its allies, a report from Kabul, printed in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA today states. This summer alone military actions against the Afghan Army and the subdivisions of the limited contingent of Soviet troops have been conducted in 32 regions in the country, where the gangs treacherously violated the conditions of the military truce and shelled towns and villages, and mined roads. In these battles the dushmans lost about 20,000 people.

Many of the enemies of reconciliation have once again become convinced that the counterrevolution will not succeed through military means. Neither the "salaries" raised during the period of reconciliation, nor the cruel medieval punishments inflicted for leaving the bands are helping to raise the morale in the bands. In Qandahar Province a leader of a bandit formation (Sulla Malang), known among his people as the "bloody mullah" because of his brutality, ordered one of his "fighters for the faith" to be thrown into a vat of boiling water, because he spoke of his desire to return to a peaceful life...

Brutality and violence—that is how the leaders hold in submission people who have entered the bands by various means. Yet the fighting capability of the dushmans is falling from day to day; dissent and dissatisfaction are growing in the bands, and many "fighters for the faith" are laying down their arms. In these conditions, (Rabbani), (Hikhmaytar), and (Khalis), the ideological inspirations behind the Afghan counterrevolution, are placing their stakes on Muslim religious fanaticism. Together with the propaganda "jihad"—the "holy war with the nonbelievers," they are stepping up the propaganda in the bands of "shehadat"—"self-sacrifice, death in the struggle for the faith." According to this teaching, each Muslim who has adopted "shehadat," if he perishes in battle, will enter paradise. The mullahs instil in the dushmans the idea that a drop of blood shed by them will wash away their sins, including murder, and that a martyrs death is better than life...

PRAVDA Profiles Warships on Gulf Escort Duty

PM071219 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Belyakov dispatch: "As Far as the Approaches to the Port of Dubayy. Soviet Ships on Patrol in the Persian Gulf"]

[Text] Aden, Dec—The crew of the large ASW ship "Admiral Tributs" is on full muster. In just a few minutes' time it will take over the duty of escorting Soviet shipping in the Persian Gulf. This duty will be handed over by the crew of the destroyer "Boyevoy." The national anthem of the Soviet Union echoes over the sea.

A ceremonial rally begins. Officers and seamen speak briefly. The essence of their statements is as follows: Ready to perform the responsible task assigned by the motherland. Captain 2d Rank N. Polunin, deputy commander for political matters on "Boyevoy," presents the crew of "Admiral Tributs" with an address from the destroyer's officers and seamen. Rear Admiral V. Sergeyev issues the order: "Take over patrol duty!"

"Aye aye, patrol duty taken over!", the commander of the large ASW ship responds.

And the seamen freeze in silence to the strains of the anthem....

Just a few hours remain before weighing anchor: I traveled back to the destroyer together with the "Boyevoy's" officers. Nikolay Semenovich called us to his quarters. Senior Lieutenant A. Bidenko, party bureau

secretary, and Lt V. Kravchenko, Komsomol committee secretary, came in. There was just one topic of conversation—the service by the destroyer's seamen in the Persian Gulf.

"This is how we operated," Polunin narrated. "We rendezvoused with our ships in the Gulf of Oman and escorted them through the Strait of Hormuz as far as the approaches to the port of Dubayy. There we 'handed over' the ships to one of our trawlers or small ASW ships, who then escorted them to their port of destination and back through the mine danger zone. We sailed into the Persian Gulf on a total of 16 occasions and escorted 22 Soviet ships through."

"Did you operate alone?"

"Of course!", Bidenko said. "Just one ship like ours is sufficient to protect several merchant ships. Even though the threat in the Persian Gulf is permanent, it stems mainly from small speedboats sailing, as rule, without identification marks."

...I recalled my visit to our dry cargo ship "Ivan Koroteyev" in the roads of the Egyptian port of Suez. The ship's crew members told me that it was the target of precisely such an attack in the Persian Gulf 4 May. The dry cargo ship suffered considerable damage. It was just by pure fortune that no one was injured. Just 2 weeks later the tanker "Admiral Chuykov" struck a mine and was holed close to the Kuwaiti port of Al-Ahmadi. It was these two incidents, the result of the escalating armed conflict between Iran and Iraq and the subsequent buildup of tension in the Persian Gulf region, that raised the question of escorting our ships.

"Have there been any incidents?"

"Not a single one," Bidenko replied. "The launches have fled as soon as they saw our ship. But the psychological conditions are, if I might say so, difficult. The sudden appearance of speedboats affects the nerves. SOS signals are broadcast continually. This is why two or three foreign ships usually attached themselves to us."

"How are the U.S. warships behaving?"

"In a challenging manner," Aleksandr Petrovich answered the question. "They provoke others with total disregard for everything. We have had instances like this. We would be escorting our ships, and the Americans would cross our path: two or three tankers and almost a dozen warships. Why sail in such an armada? We had to stop engines and let them cross even though, to be honest, our seamen were not very pleased with that."

"The battleship 'Missouri' regularly sailed into the Persian Gulf with all lights switched on, pretending to be a tanker," Polunin added. "The intention was to provoke an attack by Iranian speedboats and then open fire. The following also happened. On one occasion the 'Missouri' sailed inside the territorial waters of the United Arab Emirates and started dropping anchor. A local patrol boat approached. It asked on the radio: 'What are you doing inside our territorial waters?' The answer came: 'On your way, friend.'"

"And how about warships belonging to other Western states?"

"On the whole, they behave normally," Bidenko answered.

"Was it hard serving in the Persian Gulf?"

"It was hard," Polunin confirmed. "After all, even the climatic conditions are extremely hard there, let alone the situation. Air temperature just below 50°][centigrade], humidity almost 100%, water temperature 35° [centigrade]."

...The time to weigh anchor approached. I parted from my interlocutors and made my way ashore in a cutter. The ships slowly sailed out of the anchorage. Suddenly the strains of "The Slav Woman's Farewell" echoed above the waters. The destroyer "Boyevoy," having honorably performed its task, is on its way home, while the "Admiral Tributs" takes course for the Persian Gulf.

The seamen sailing Soviet merchant ships can rest assured.

East Europe

SFRY Presidium Welcomes Summit Missile Treaty

LD091742 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1028 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Belgrade, 9 Dec (TASS)—The Presidium of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has sent congratulatory messages to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan on the occasion of signing the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on elimination of the medium- and shorter-range missiles.

Through this act of exceptional importance, following lengthy and complex negotiations that proceeded with your personal participation, the message goes, the decision is beging taken for the first time to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons. This is the best possible confirmation that disarmament and normalization of international relations in a more secure world are not only necessary but possible.

We are convinced that this treaty, which is historic through its significance and the prospects it offers, will commence a new stage in talks on crucial problems facing the present-day world, and among which development issues have the same priority rating as disarmament.

To achieve these aims, participation and contribution of all countries is needed. Yugoslavia, as a UN member, as a member country of the Nonaligned Movement, will take an active part in the global processes directed at securing a safer world, disarmament, equitable cooperation and development, and will do its best to contribute to that cause, the messages by the Yugoslav leadership say.

GDR's Krentz, Norway's Foerde Hail INF Treaty

LD071914 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Berlin December 7 TASS—All who sincerely advocate peace and international cooperation are inspired by the upcoming signing of the agreement to scrap Soviet and American medium and shorter range missiles. This was stated by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Egon Krentz and Deputy Chairman of the Norwegian Labour Party Einar Foerde, now on a visit to the GDR.

Meeting in Berlin today they welcomed the Mikhail Gorbachev-Ronald Reagan meeting. The treaty is to be followed by agreements on a considerable reduction of strategic armaments and prevention of the arms race in outer space through consolidation of the ABM Treaty and termination of all nuclear tests. It is necessary to have in Europe a much lower level of conventional armaments.

Polish School Receives Gorbachev Message

LD092358 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1952 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Boleslawiec (Poland), 9 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Valentin Volkov reports: Today in this ancient town in Jelenia Gora Voivodship of Poland there was a meeting of Polish-Soviet friendship on the occasion of the presentation of the reply from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a letter from the collective of municipal secondary school No 8, named after the fighters for freedom and democracy. Present at the meeting were H. Bednarski, secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, Polish minister of national education, and chairman of the main board of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society; and representatives of voivodship and municipal authorities and of the public. The text of the reply was presented by USSR Ambassador to Poland V.I. Brovikov.

Greeting the Soviet leader on the 70th anniversary of Great October, the teachers and pupils of the school stress in their letter that they are heart and soul together with all the citizens of the Land of the Soviets in the historic transformations, the great accomplishments, and the process of restructuring in the USSR. The school collective maintains broad contacts with Soviet educational establishments, together with which it is building symbolic bridges into the future, believing sacredly in a world without war and violence and in a happy future for the younger generation.

M.S. Gorbachev's reply says: "Dear friends! I heartily thank you for the greetings on the 70th anniversary of Great October, and for your wishes for the success of restructuring, and for your kind sentiments.

"I was sincerely gladdened by your close and friendly ties with Soviet children. Relations of friendship, fraternity, and cooperation are a fine heritage of the Soviet and Polish peoples. We highly value and cherish them.

"I wish the teachers and pupils of your school success in work and study, and I wish them happiness, prosperity, and peace".

It is symbolic, H. Bednarski said in a speech, that our meeting is taking place at a historic moment when the treaty has been signed between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. Thus an exceptionally important step forward has been taken in the cause of disarmament. We hope that peace and a happy future will be guaranteed for our children and for peoples of the whole planet.

The participants in the meeting adopted an appeal for peace.

West Europe

Thatcher Reacts to Gorbachev's UK Visit

Holds Press Conference

PM101325 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondent A. Lyutiy dispatch: "'Relations Have Got Better.' M. Thatcher's Speech"]

[Text] London—At the press conference held after the departure of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from Britain, PRAVDA's special correspondent asked British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to describe the present state of Soviet-British relations.

I think, she replied, that Soviet-British relations are now good. I think they are better than they have ever been in the past. This improvement began after Mr Gorbachev began to implement the policy of restructuring and glasnost. It is absolutely clear that a number of ideas which we believe in, for instance, the broadening of personal initiative and responsibility, are being implemented in the USSR. We wish you success in these efforts.

As for the sphere of arms control, both our states understand that each country has the right to defense and wants to have reliable defense. Making provision for defense at lower levels of armament must be implemented by means of balanced reductions, because balance brings stability and security.

In my opinion, we are now living in a historic time: first, because of the bold initiatives being put forward in the Soviet Union, and second because the treaty which is to be signed is not merely a treaty on nuclear arms reduction. It is also a guarantee that the cooperation and persistent, scrupulous work which have enabled this document to emerge can also be effective in the sphere of reducing intercontinental ballistic missiles, chemical weapons, and possibly, conventional weapons too. This illustrates that where there's a will, there's a way. I am tremendously pleased that the delegations have worked persistently on the monitoring provisions. You will soon be acquainted with them. They are extremely interesting. The fact that the sides—the Americans in the Soviet Union, and the USSR, for instance, in Britain or the FRG—will conduct the inspections is a new element. They will continue not just for 3 years, until the missiles are destroyed, but for another 10 years, to enable us to ensure observance of the treaty.

Thus there is a multitude of reasons which explain why times are now much better. I said to Mr Gorbachev—and I say this to many politicians and groups of listeners—that 13 years remain to the end of the present millenium. We should be thinking about this too, both from the viewpoint of history and from the viewpoint of the objective we seek. There are now two categories of politicians in any country. The first state: "We cannot do this or that, because the difficulties are immense. Look how many there are!" Then they begin to enumerate all the difficulties and do not achieve anything. The politicians in the other category say: "Yes, the difficulties are great, but the possibilities are even more imposing. We will overcome the difficulties to achieve these possibilities."

In response to questions, M. Thatcher stated at the same time that she does not think attainment of a nuclear-free world is possible and repeated her well-known position, which amounts to saying that peace in the postwar years has supposedly been ensured by the opposing sides' possession of nuclear weapons.

Moscow TV Interview on Visit

LD092349 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2002 GMT 9 Dec 87

[from "the World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin; interview with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain by "World Today" correspondent Vsevolod Shishkovskiy in London on 9 December; interview conducted in English with superimposed Russian translation—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Shishkovskiy] Mr Gorbachev stressed at your meeting that the role of Europe in present circumstances should increase, since without this, any great problems cannot be solved. What sort of role do you see for Europe?

[Thatcher] I have always considered Europe's role to be very important. After all, Europe was the arena of operations in two world wars. Therefore, it is so essential for us to reach an agreement on arms control. But we need to go even further. Relations between Western and Eastern Europe are not only based on arms control. There are relations between people of European countries. We are also interested in broadening human rights. Restructuring and glasnost seem to us to be an extremely important move forward. It is the liberation of the individual and ideas. It is a process stimulating personal responsibility, people's personal initiative. We wish to see a respectful attitude to the Helsinki accords. So relations between Western and Eastern Europe are seen by us as not just arms control. But when we are able to agree on arms control and able to ensure defense at a lower level of armaments than the one which now exists, people will be able to mix with each other more. People will have greater trust in each other and more goodwill. Of course, time is needed to attain this. We will be following very attentively—you, us, and we, you—but we now have a hope and a possibility of ensuring that there should never be another war. It would tear Europe to pieces and bring terrible casualties, suffering, and tragedy, such as many of us have already seen in our lives. There still lives in the Soviet Union, in Europe, and in the United States a generation to whom we are indebted. We must make sure that war is never repeated.

[Shishkovskiy] You have just met and had talks with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, here in Britain.

[Thatcher] It was very pleasant for us. It was so pleasant for us to receive him. His visit and that of Mrs Gorbachev was wonderful. All of Britain was delighted over the fact that he came, delighted at the warmth of relations and at the fact that there was success in attaining a Soviet-U.S. treaty. In this we saw a sign of hope for the future, hope not caused by euphoria. This is a realistic hope.

[Shishkovskiy] At this point in time, what are the relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union?

[Thatcher] They are good. We try to achieve closer mutual relations in trade. When I visited the Soviet Union, I told Mr Gorbachev about certain cases where people wanted to leave Russia to be reunited with their families. He did everything that he promised me. You understand, for us it is very strange that people want to leave a country and cannot. This is precisely why we signed the agreement in Helsinki. But everything Mr Gorbachev promised me he would do in this respect, he has done, and we hope that these eff rts will be broadened. We would not like it if in our m. utual relations we proceeded only from the need for defense. We are in favor of expanding trade relations; we would like to see more visits, more cultural agreements. We would like to

invite to our country more schoolchildren and more families, in order to build closer relations and understanding with Soviet people, particularly in the new era in the Soviet Union, which Mr Gorbachev has proclaimed with all straightforwardness and courage. We, most intently and hopefully, are following this era.

[Shishkovskiy] The last question, Mrs Thatcher. Would you not like to express any wishes to Soviet television viewers?

[Thatcher] Of course. I would like to very much. I will begin with this: Mrs Gorbachev visited a British school. In the school, they were holding the annual Christmas performance. People came and greeted her in the street, while the children—she loves children—surrounded her on all sides. She said to one little boy: Tell me, do you know about the Soviet Union? Oh yes, he knew about the Soviet Union, and she probably thought they had told him about the Soviet Union on the eve of her visit, and she asked: How long have you known about the Soviet Union? All my life, he said. Wasn't that wonderful? He is 9 years old, and he knew about the USSR. This is especially important, that at Christmas, which means so much for us, since it is a time of peace and goodwill. We were able to welcome a new treaty between the USSR and the United States, to welcome it as a herald of a new era in our closer relations. We know that next year, you will be marking the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia, so that we send out to all people in the Soviet Union words full of warmth, goodwill, and hope. We send you all of our love and best wishes for the future.

[Shishkovskiy] Thank you very much for this interview, Mrs Thatcher. Permit me to wish you and your family all the very best, and peace and prosperity to the British people.

[Thatcher] Peace and prosperity to all of us. Thank you.

Moscow TV Interview on Treaty

LD091834 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Interview with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher by unidentified Correspondent in London on 9 December—recorded; in English with superimposed Russian translation; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mrs Thatcher, what is your opinion on the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty eliminating intermediate-range nuclear weapons?

[Thatcher] It is an excellent treaty. It is good news for both the Soviet Union and the West, good news not only thanks to the treaty itself, but also because if we could agree here, then we c other treaties. So this gives hope for the future that both sides can provide for their own defense with a much lower level of armaments.

[Correspondent] If I have understood you correctly, the treaty just signed in Washington will become a new stage in development of international relations. If this is so, what prospects do you see for the future?

[Thatcher] Yes, it is a new stage, because this is the first treaty in the history of mankind to reduce nuclear weapons. It is a new stage because the talks on it were difficult. We wanted to be sure of each other. In such matters, we do not take each other's words on trust. There must be a situation here which can provide a reliable check so that our words do not diverge from our deeds. It was difficult to reach agreement on these provisions. But, insofar as the desire was there, the solution was found. We all wanted it, and so we were able to achieve success. This is also a new aspect.

I think that personal qualities helped, too. My stances have always been close to those of President Reagan. But, as I have found out for myself, it is easy to conduct lively discussions and debates with Mr Gorbachev. In this, no one yielded an inch on their position. But that aside, thanks to these very detailed and friendly discussions, with more understanding we have come closer to accords. And so, the Soviet-U.S. treaty signifies a new era in two senses. First, it is a success which gives hope for the future. Second, those individuals who themselves took part in this process correspond to the spirit of the times. But, you know, I am constantly thinking of how we are approaching the end of the century, to the year 2000. We have only about 12 years to make the next century the way we want it, and we are applying all our efforts to this end.

Gorbachev's Visit 'Pleasant'

PM100945 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own Correspondent A. Krivopalov report: "The European Viewpoint"]

[Text] London—When our group of several Soviet newsmen was returning to London from Brize Norton after M.S. Gorbachev's conversation there with British Prime Minister M. Thatcher, the driver of the limousine kindly placed at our disposal by the prime minister's office remarked: "I will never forget this historic day."

Like us, he had watched the eminent Soviet visitor's arrival and departure and was absorbed by the atmosphere of genuine emotion prevailing at the press center where over 400 British and foreign journalists had gathered. Mr Kh. Vusers has seen a thing or two in his time, by the way. So what he says carries a certain weight.

Back at Brize Norton, many foreign colleagues told us that in their opinion this stopover on British soil by the eminent visitor from Moscow was of profound significance because it was organically linked with the talks in Washington. The conversation between the Soviet and British leaders, which took place in a friendly and frank

atmosphere, stressed once again the particular European viewpoint on the problem of nuclear disarmament, the first step toward which has been taken by the signing of the treaty on elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

There is another significant aspect to the exchange of opinions between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the British prime minister. It showed that both sides are interested in ensuring that dialogue between them becomes more businesslike and constructive in character. In a short press statement at Brize Norton, M.S. Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet leadership is ready to continue broadening and deepening cooperation and deepening mutual understanding between our two countries.

After seeing off the eminent visitor and his entourage, M. Thatcher met with journalists at the airfield. This conversation lasted half an hour. The Soviet-British summit talks were held in a "very good atmosphere," the British prime minister told journalists.

"It was very pleasant to meet Mr and Mrs Gorbachev again," M. Thatcher said, "and to have talks with Mr Gorbachev, who is on his way to an historic summit meeting in Washington.... We are on the threshold of the first agreement between the two major powers providing for reducing and destroying of certain classes of nuclear armaments." "I wish Mr Gorbachev's meeting with President Reagan great success, and we welcome the agreement on medium-range missiles." The prime minister expressed the hope that the agreement will be a step toward attainment of further agreements on reduction of offensive strategic, chemical, and conventional armaments.

"When Mr Gorbachev and I meet, we have a very lively discussion," she noted. "He is a powerful personality, and I am strong-natured too. That is why our conversations are always lively, but for that reason we are able to pass on rapidly to discussion of the essential matters."

"I found Mr Gorbachev's account, particularly with regard to the progress of restructuring, absolutely fascinating. He is a bold, determined, and courageous leader, and I hope that he succeeds in his colossal task, because in so doing he will enlarge the sum of human freedom and happiness."

The prime minister characterized the general state of Soviet-British relations as good. "I consider them better now than at any time since Mr Gorbachev began the policy of restructuring and glasnost, since it is obvious that some of the things that we in the West believe in—greater personal initiative and responsibility—are being encouraged in the Soviet Union, and we wish these efforts success."

"I believe we are living in historic times," Mrs Thatcher pointed out. "Not only because bold initiatives are being implemented in the Soviet Union but also because of the agreement soon to be signed. It not only provides for reduction of nuclear armaments but also offers the prospect that cooperation and persistent, painstaking work which made it possible will also be applied to discussions on intercontinental missiles, chemical weapons, and perhaps conventional armaments. It shows that where there's a will, there's a way."

At the same time, M. Thatcher remarked that she did not believe it possible to achieve a nuclear-free world.

Newspapers published in London the next morning reported that, after the IL-62's departure for Washington, the head of the British cabinet telephoned the U.S. president, with whom she has long-standing and very good relations of trust. M. Thatcher gave R. Reagan her impressions of the talks with the CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

The British press has paid very great attention to the meeting between the Soviet and British leaders at Brize Norton. Every journalist covering the meeting draws attention to particular details he remembers most of all. I, too, have such an impression. As M.S. Gorbachev got into the car which was to take him to the steps of the IL-62, one of the airfield security guards alongside me said over his radio: "Movement begun." I took these words other than as an official message. They seemed symbolic. Movement toward nuclear disarmament has really begun.

Journalists 'Refuse' To Note Emigration Progress

LD091840 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent writes:

When addressing a press conference after the completion of Mikhail Gorbachev's short working visit to Britain, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher devoted attention to the problem of departure of people from the Soviet Union.

She said that more people were now able to leave the Soviet Union and that she noted with special satisfaction the reunification of families which were in the centre of attention and the growth in the number of people who got permission from Soviet authorities to leave the Soviet Union. The British premier also voiced hope that this process would be intensified and noted that the number of people who left the Soviet Union this year was substantially bigger as compared to last year.

Some Western journalists are trying to narrow the problem of human rights and reduce it to the problem of departure from the USSR and the position of Jews in the Soviet Union. This, evidently, explains the question

which was put at this press conference to the British premier. But since this subject was broached it is important to emphasise that the trends mentioned by Margaret Thatcher are confirmed by statistics.

Thus, more than 26,000 people, including 7,000 children aged under 18, were permitted to leave the Soviet Union this year. This is much more than last year. Another trend is the considerable decline in the number of applications to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. At present there are only several hundred such applications. Mention should also be made of the increase in the number of people who got permission to leave the USSR for Israel but decided against leaving. There were more than 300 such cases this year, as against only 63 in 1986.

The number of departures from the USSR on private visits, that is to meet relatives and friends, has doubled in the first half of 1987 as compared to the same period of last year. Many people have no intention of leaving the Soviet Union for good and only want to visit their relatives abroad.

Such are the important results of the process of Soviet society's democratisation in this concrete field. Some Western journalists, who are egged on by Zionist circles in the West wishing to impede a constructive development of the Soviet-American dialogue, stubbornly refuse to notice this.

Appeal for Frenchman Detained in DRA Attacked

PM081151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 87
First Edition p 5

[PRAVDA own correspondent V. Okulov dispatch: "Why Alain Guillo Was Detained"; first six paragraphs take the form of an introduction]

[Text] "Telegram From Paris:

"Moscow, PRAVDA Editorial Offices:

"Within the framework of Mikhail Gorbachev's new policy of glasnost, we send you an appeal in support of Alain Guillo. We would like to bring this appeal to your notice and also to the notice of Soviet public opinion.

"Alain Guillo, a French reporter, who was one of the first people to write major articles about Afghanistan, has been in solitary confinement in a Kabul torture chamber for several weeks.

"The signatories urge international public opinion and governments committed to the principles of freedom of speech to act without delay to defend this man whose only crime is that he witnesses things and informs people about them.

"Friends of Alain Guillo—Jacques Abouchar, Philippe Alfonsi [surname as published], Lucien Bodard, Jerome Boni [surname as published]... Twenty-one signatures in all."

Kabul, December—When I tackled officials of the competent Afghan organs and mentioned the telegram from France received by PRAVDA, they were perplexed by its content. Why, as soon as they became alarmed about his fate, did the authors of the telegram not consider it necessary to ask the Afghan authorities about him, which would be the natural thing to do? Can they really not get the information of interest to them from the French Embassy in Kabul? Or do they simply prefer not to ask questions but instead to sound the alarm straight off and kick up a fuss since this is what they are more used to and what suits them better? My interlocutors reached the conclusion that this was most likely the case, for Guillo's "defenders" cannot help but know that questions are inevitably followed by answers which reveal the main thing—the reasons for his detention and the methods he was employing.

So what is the crux of the "Guillo affair"? What is his fate?

I was told that the information Guillo was gathering in Afghanistan concerned the country's state and military interests. This French citizen who infiltrated the country along with a dushman gang told the investigation many details of his illegal "journey." It continued from gang to gang until a large armed detachment of rebels in Faryab Province who had switched to the side of state power handed the foreigner over to its representatives.

Of course, collecting information by exercising the principle of freedom of speech, which is the right of any journalist moreover, is the only way he can execute his professional commitments. Even so, however, this does entail him gathering information by methods other than those used by specialist housebreakers. It is presumably not worth stating that the nature of this information must not put in doubt the journalist's professional affiliation.

I would ask the authors of the telegram to exercise their imagination for a minute. Imagine that a foreign journalist arrived in France by a not generally accepted route—after asking its authorities' permission but then crossing the border secretly with the help of terrorist groups who consider these authorities to be their enemy. And that then after "working" illegally in France, he fell into the hands of the local police together with the terrorists.

How, gentlemen, would you assess such an episode? What ending would you recommend? I think you would probably be indignant at the effrontery with which a representative of the foreign press, flouting French laws,

showed disrespect for the country's sovereignty. The moral aspect of such a "method"—cooperation with bandits and killers—would also probably evoke condemnation.

Why then is your approach different in the Guillo case?

If we are talking about journalists, then many foreign correspondents have visited Afghanistan in recent months. They include representatives of the BBC, a U.S.-Finnish television group, and journalists from the United States, Portugal, and Mexico. Of course, they went there legally, as is accepted throughout the world. They freely executed their professional commitments and gathered information. The authorities helped them travel around the country, and they were able to talk with ordinary people and interview people of the highest rank.

Their reports on these trips were varied and often extremely impartial. So, that is the journalist's freedom of speech. But these people did act honestly. However, there are also many people who love to act "in an underhanded manner." I had occasion to write about the American C. Thornton. He came to a bad end. In September 1985, he infiltrated Afghanistan as part of a counterrevolutionary gang and became a casualty of its clash with a rival gang. A year earlier, the TV journalist Jacques Abouchar tried to "travel" around Afghan territory with an armed group of dushmans. You could say he was lucky. He barely survived the rout of the gang, was arrested, tried, and confessed that he was guilty of illegally crossing the border and cooperating with the counterrevolution; however, despite all this, he was pardoned by the Afghan authorities on humanitarian grounds. And what happens? Jacques Abouchar has signed the telegram "in support" of—that is, vindicating—Guillo, that same Abouchar who in his time was shown humanity in Kabul. The lesson, clearly, has not been learned.

Guillo is, naturally, being held in custody for violating DRA laws. An investigation is under way. I was told that Guillo is completely healthy and does not complain about his treatment. As for the fact that he ignored generally accepted norms and laws, it has emerged that this is normal practice for him: This is the ninth time he has entered Afghanistan illegally.

Gorbachev Congratulates French CP Leader

PM101209 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Undated message of congratulation from "M. Gorbachev" to newly reelected French Communist Party Secretary General Georges Marchais]

[Text] To Comrade Georges Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party.

Dear Comrade Marchais!

Hearty congratulations on your reelection as secretary general of the French Communist Party.

I wish you and all French Communists great success in the struggle for working people's fundamental interests and for the triumph of the ideas of peace and socialism.

Communist greetings,

M. Gorbachev.

Soviet, EC Parliamentarians Meet in Moscow

PM091443 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] The strengthening of international cooperation was the main theme of a conversation in Moscow 8 December between L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, and E. Parodi, eminent doctor and deputy of the European Parliament.

The interlocutors noted that this visit continues the contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the European Parliament and pointed to the importance of developing and strengthening them in the interests of stabilizing the situation in Europe and consolidating world peace.

Both sides expressed wishes for the success of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington and stressed its truly historic significance.

Latin America & Caribbean

Plane Violating Nicaraguan Airspace Shot Down

LD091556 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Managua December 9 TASS—Nicaragua's antiaircraft gunners have downed a plane over the territory of the Republic. The American pilot was taken prisoner by the fighters of the Sandinist Peoples' Army after the antiaircraft fire damaged the Cessna plane and forced it to make an emergency landing near the town of San Juan del Norte, several kilometres from the Costa Rican border.

The pilot was found to carry an American passport issued to the name of James Jordan Denby and various documents testifying to his links with the contras and U.S. Secret Services, Nicaragua's Defense Minister Humberto Ortega told a press conference here on Tuesday.

The journalists were shown pictures of one of the contra camps and other documents proving Denby's involvement in the hostile activities against Nicaragua. The mercenary testified that he had been trained in the U.S.

Armed Forces and lived in Costa Rica since 1973. There he became an active member of the antisandinist and anticommunist organisation farmers, set up by the CIA. Humberto Ortega also said that Somozista mercenaries used to meet at Denby's farm to devise new acts of sabotage against Nicaragua.

One of Denby's documents describes a meeting between a CIA agent, John Hull, and Adolfo Calero, the ringleader of the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries. The meeting is believed to have focused on organising the murder of Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto. Nicaraguan security bodies are currently holding a thorough investigation and studying the information.

Pilot Linked to CIA, Contras

LD091806 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—TASS Political Analyst Nikolay Chigir writes:

Soldiers of the Sandinist People's Army downed another plane which violated the Nicaraguan state border. The pilot who survived the crash, turned out to be a U.S. national—James Jordan Denby. Documents found on him show his close contacts with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and contra gangs which are used by Washington to wage the underclared war against Nicaragua. Reports from Managua say that Demby was directly connected with the CIA's secret activities to train counter-revolutionary mercenaries for terrorist operations in Nicaragua and to supply them with arms and ammunition. They reveal his contacts with Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North, a high-ranking CIA agent and the "hero" of the Irangate.

Incidentally, Denby is not the first air buccaneer, on the CIA's payroll, who was downed over Nicaragua. Slightly a year ago a transport plane C-123 which had carried arms and intruded Nicaraguan airspace, had been downed in that country. It was piloted by three Americans. Surviving U.S. serviceman Eugene Hasenfus testified at the trial that he, as well as two killed American pilots, had been recruited by the CIA to supply arms to contra gangs.

The latest intrusion of Nicaraguan airspace by a plane piloted by U.S. citizen Denby is not an accidental and isolated event. This is another irrefutable evidence of the USA's direct participation in the undeclared war against Nicaragua. The fact confirms again that the CIA pulled and pulls all the strings of aggressive anti-Nicaraguan actions, as a result of which over 45,000 Nicaraguans were killed.

The continuation of the anti-Nicaraguan hostile activities by the USA shows that the Washington leadership stakes on scuttling the Guatemalan agreement. The U.S. ruling quarters which launched the aggressive policy against Nicaragua seven years ago, fanned up an armed conflict in Central America. We eye-witness now that they are interfering in every way with its peaceful political settlement. Setting the aim of quashing Nicaraguan revolution, they continue dangerously whipping up tension in the region.

Reporters Link AID to CIA in Latin America

PA100254 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Victor Deruga and German Alcantara feature on "Latin American Current Events" program]

[Text] The U.S. agency AID has been charged with manipulating the domestic affairs of underdeveloped countries to maintain U.S. supremacy over them.

The agency was recently invited by the Panamanian Government to leave Panama.

I have reports that AID serves as a bridge for the CIA, to finance covert actions in Latin America.

Political & Social

High-Level Corruption Implied in Bribes

PM071731 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 13

[Article by Yuriy Shchekochikhin under the rubric "Morals and the Law": "The Storm After the Storm"]

[Text] At the end of July 1985, a report appeared in the Odessa Oblast paper ZNAMYA KOMMUNIZMA to the effect that oblast internal affairs administration criminal investigation department senior inspector Korotkov had been convicted of taking bribes. Soon the same paper reported the criminal culmination of the career of Goretskiy, chief of a rayon department for combating socialist property theft and speculation [OBKHSS]. The name Malyshev—city OBKHSS chief—cropped up in both items. In the first, he had been "dismissed from Internal Affairs Ministry bodies"; the second explained the reason for the dismissal: taking bribes.

But rumors that Malyshev had been caught accepting bribes had started to circulate in Odessa long before his name cropped up in the newspapers, and I am afraid that not many people in Odessa, on hearing about the incident, exclaimed angrily: Bribes?! At the OBKHSS?! It cannot be!...

It was by no means a question of Malyshev personally, although the facts of his career had become a topic of discussion in the shady avenues of Odessa. People were surprised, saying that he had climbed the career ladder too quickly: Already deputy at 24, and then chief of the rayon OBKHSS; in the city police department at 27 and OBKHSS chief in a city of one million people at the tender age of 29. And the year he took up his important post—1982!—was also bound to set tongues wagging: "We know who they appointed then and how they went about it." It was said that some strong hand had propelled him up the career ladder: either in Kiev or in Moscow. They also wondered how far (most important, how high) his connections—drive belts in the era of stagnation—extended.

But it was the social reputation of the post that had a far greater effect on public opinion than Malyshev's personal characteristics: "OBKHSS chief?" "Well, that makes it all clear...."

Rumor was rife in the city, anticipating events and, perhaps, precipitating them. So when the people of Odessa heard the news that Malyshev had been arrested in August 1985 they saw it as the proper outcome. At last....

I remember Malyshev's name appearing often in letters from Odessa at that time. Our readers in Odessa associated his release from his post and arrest with the wind of change that would sweep away all the filth that had accumulated in the past. "More, more..."—the readers demanded. Malyshev is only the start, a small cog in the criminal system enmeshing the city. But there were other letters from Odessa (although far fewer) voicing doubts: Is Malyshev guilty? Were the rumors about him not malicious? Is it not people trying to settle old scores?

A year later, a young Odessa policeman arrived at the editorial offices: "The Malyshev case was fabricated. Some others too." "Is that your theory?" "I know it for a fact!"

It was a long story and, to be honest, I was skeptical. On the other hand... anything can happen!

As we parted I asked him to put it all down in a letter to the editor. He refused: "What I am claiming cannot be proved!..." "But are you sure it is true?" "Yes, it is true.... But there is no legal proof in that truth."

It was not until much later, in the fall, that I was to recognize what the words meant and realize what a risk he had taken in visiting the editorial offices.

But, as I was saying... What were we to do? There was only one thing to do: inform the prosecutors office of the views of those who doubted Malyshev's guilt. We realized that the case must not be that easy if it was dragging on for so long, if the court had been unable to pass sentence, if they were analayzing the facts of the affair again and again in some room somewhere. But we also knew that the authorization for the arrest of Malyshev had not been canceled and he remained behind bars.

Then suddenly, this fall, 1987, the telephone rang. I lifted the receiver:

"Hello... It's me—Malyshev..."

The editorial offices had emptied long before, it was dark on our quiet side street, and somewhere along the corridor in a locked office the ring of a telephone could be heard, sounding loud in the deserted building as, saying goodbye to Aleksandr Viktorovich Malyshnev, I began to read through the notes I had made during our 3-hour conversation. Was it all true? Was it not the fevered imagination of a man with a grudge? Was it not a dream from another decade in our mysterious epoch?

Here are some extracts from my notes.

I asked about the circumstances of the arrest. He said:

"In August 1985 I was in Moscow, where the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs was considering the question of my reinstatement in the police. On 16 August—it was a Saturday—I was summoned to 6 Ogarev Street. There I was told that there had been a favorable decision. I went down the stairs and opened the door.... The first person I saw was Tretyakov—a member of our Odessa criminal investigation department. He was coming toward me, holding his hand out, as if eager to shake my

hand. I took a step toward him and, suddenly, I was surrounded by seven or eight people.... I was handcuffed.... Then we all got in cars and went off to the airport. Tretyakov called someone up.... It was a very clear line and I recognized the voice of Starovetskiy, chief of the internal affairs administration. 'What, you've found him?' he asked. Tretyakov confirmed that he had. 'Bring him to the jail.' That evening I was already in cell 13...."

The next day, 17 August, senior assistant prosecutor Belskiy charged Malyshev with accepting bribes from various people in the trade sphere—from a market worker to a store director. That evening he got a cellmate, a criminal with four convictions. He tried to persuade Malyshev to say what senior duty officer Bobovskiy ordered him to say.... "I mean," he said, "Goretskiy obeyed him and he only got 5 years...."

Glancing further down the notes:

"At the beginning of September I was visited in my cell by Odessa Oblast prosecutor Zimarin. He said that no one would help me now, not even the Politburo (those were his words). But, according to him, there was a solution—obedience. If I would be obedient I would be out soon; if not—I would never get out."

"But obedient in what way, Aleksandr Viktorovich?" "I put the same question to Zimarin. He replied that Bobovskiy would tell me the details...."

"And did Bobovskiy tell you?"

"He turned up that evening and told me that I should 'spread' the bribes I had allegedly accepted to some other people. First he gave three names: oblast deputy prosecutor, oblast internal affairs administration deputy chief, and city internal affairs administration chief. He tried to tell me that 'it served them right,' that he would help me give the testimony veracity, that no one would rumble him, and that he would arrange for false witnesses to corroborate everything. He had put his cards on the table. I was promised better food, I would be able to see my mother, and I would get the minimum punishment in the end."

"And you believed this?"

"Of course, I believed it. In a jail there are no secrets, and I knew that the arrested traders who had given false evidence about me were living the kind of life that few people at liberty could aspire to. Every day they were brought fish, sausages, and even black caviar in a teapot...."

"What did you say to Bobovskiy's proposal?"

"What could I say? I refused. But 2 days later he came again and added another two names to the list—the first secretary of the party gorkom and chief of the gorkom administrative organs department. 'Come on, let's get on with it...' he insisted."

"How often did you see Bobovskiy?"

"Whereas the investigator might not turn up for a week, or even a month, Bobovskiy came nearly every day. He would say: 'If you do not comply, we will get some more people to "own up" to having given you bribes.' And that is what happened. In the evening Bobovskiy was trying to persuade me, the next morning Belskiy came with new evidence against me. As if all the Odessa traders had suddenly rushed in to confess that they had been bribing me—the chief of the city OBKHSS!"

"And did the oblast prosecutor visit you often?"

"About ten times... Once he told me that... was in the neighboring cell. He gave the name of an important party leader from Kiev. 'He has admitted everything,' the prosecutor said. 'Now it's your turn.' On another occasion he suggested I give 'evidence' against a republican leader. 'You must say that you took cases of brandy to his dacha ' 'What good does that do anybody?' I objected. 'You idiot,' Zimarin replied. 'They're going to shoot you anyway....' Once he came with Bobovskiy at two in the morning, showed me my release order, and told me that my mother and grandmother were near death.... If I would provide the requisite evidence he, Zimarin, would immediately sign my release, and a car was waiting below to take me home. Occasionally Bobovskiy would lay on a meal in the actual jail. Once I saw Goretskiy at the table. He tried to persuade me not to make things difficult and he drank brandy after brandy. If you agree, he said, come and sit with us."

"What is your worst memory of those days?"

"Bobovskiy once said thoughtfully: 'Perhaps they want to make you a spy?'"

"Did you hope that someone would investigate and save you?"

"I realized what the system was: I was their pawn in some grand game and they needed me as a false witness.... But there was a fleeting hope once: By order of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, Shashkin, of the Georgian Prosecutor's Office, took charge of the investigation group. But, most likely, they also put pressure on him.... I remember him saying when we parted: 'I would be glad to help you but I'm getting all these anonymous letters... I am due for promotion. What can I do. Sorry...'"

I read through my notes again and again, making myself doubt rather than believe what I had heard. Because if you believe totally that that kind of thing could happen today, you begin to doubt whether the roots of the bitter

past have been completely destroyed. That it, the past, still keeps on showing through, like old newspapers beneath the wallpaper. Threats, blackmail, denunciation, nocturnal interrogation, and then sudden slap-up meals in dark prison rooms. Is one supposed to be grateful for not being beaten up?!

I reflected on this as I sat in the empty editorial offices, putting my notes in order and, later, as I went home through the evening streets.

Can it really be true, all that?

I remember asking Malyshev:

"But who needed to organize all this around you? Around you specifically?"

"I was incidental," he said. "Obstinate, what's more. The thing is, that back in 1983, General Starovetskiy had been appointed chief of the internal affairs administration—he had been transferred to Odessa from Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast. Once he called me on the carpet and told me to admit how much money I had given to to the former party obkom first secretary and the internal affairs administration chief.... He knew it was nonsense, but he suggested that I play the game. I complained to the obkom. That is how it all began: I was already doomed. They had a go at me at every conference, then I was suspended from my post, and then I was dismissed.... I went to Moscow and found out that they were starting to fabricate a criminal case against me. But I did not think I would end up being arrested...."

At home I went through the indictment A.V. Malyshev had left with me. It was more than 100 pages long. It gave the names of those who had been giving bribes and those who had been present, and there were the incriminatory confessions of witnesses.

By the time the charge was made, A.V. Malyshev had already been in jail for 10 months and was about to appear before the court.

I found the "Odesfoto" factory in Odessa and, at the factory, the office of the director, I.V. Kislenko, who had been, in the recent past, an investigator at the oblast Prosecutor's Office.

"Igor Vladimirovich," I said. "Why did you attend the Malyshev trial?"

"I was called as a witness since I had dealt with the Goretskiy case...."

"But where does Malyshev come into it?"

"OK... I will tell you it all from the very beginning."

This is what I heard from I.V. Kislenko.

When he was conducting the case against rayon OBKHSS chief Goretskiy, he asked on more than one occasion what the latter had spent the bribe money of R1,000 on, and each time he got the answer: "On personal needs." Then, in court, Goretskiy announced: "I gave the money to Malyshev." Why Malyshev? Where did Malyshev spring from?

"Do you think, Igor Vladimirovich, that Goretskiy was leniently treated by the court because of his evidence against Malyshev?"

"When the trial started, I was summoned by prosecutor Zimarin. 'We intend to give Goretskiy 5 years—no more. Do you object?' I was amazed he had asked the question, but Zimarin explained: 'It's his due. We need him....'"

Goretskiy's evidence subsequently appeared in the indictment against Malyshev. But that was not enough.

The case of an OBKHSS chief in another rayon—Skorishchenko—was being investigated at the same time. It was proved that he had received R15,000 in bribes. The money had to be handed over to the state, the whole lot. But the man under investigation kept on delaying the return of the money.

"Then," I.V. Kislenko continued, "I discovered that he had made a new statement saying that he had given the rest of the money to Malyshev as a bribe. I said to him: 'Aren't you ashamed of yourself, Sasha?' He replied: 'It's a special case. Special...'"

So there was yet another witness against Malyshev.

"And you told them this at the trial?"

"Yes, I told them...."

"And you were dismissed from the prosecutor's office like the other investigators who had given a true account of the events in court?..."

"Oh no, I had been dismissed somewhat before, but there was a common acquaintance linking us to the Malyshev case."

"Who?" I asked.

The first famous "police" case in Odessa was the arrest of criminal investigation department inspector Korotkov. He was caught in the act of receiving a R7,000 bribe. I.V. Kislenko was instructed to handle the case. When it came to the trial the R7,000 were needed as material evidence. The trial took place, Korotkov was sentenced, but there was no mention of the fate of the money in the judgment. I.V. Kislenko went to the judge who, instead of giving an explanation, smiled mysteriously: "Take it easy... Don't think about it." A few days later prosecutor Zimarin summoned him and said that

the money—the R7,000—HAD been handed over to Bobovskiy. "Where does Bobovskiy fit in?" Kislenko said, taken aback. The answer was: "He deserves it...." I.V. Kislenko carried out his chief's order and gave the money to Bobovskiy, obtaining a receipt. A few days later Zimarin demanded that the receipt be returned to Bobovskiy. Kislenko did not agree. He was subsequently dismissed and criminal proceedings were instituted which were terminated, but not until the beginning of last May, by the USSR Prosecutor's Office "for want of evidence that a crime had taken place."

"But the hunt for Bobovskiy's receipt has now ended?"

"I do not know their plans.... But I am keeping it in a safe place. They will not find it...."

My next interlocutor in Odessa was G.P. Shulyachenko—until recently chief of the department supervising the examination of criminal cases in the courts of the Odessa Oblast Prosecutor's Office.

"Grigoriy Pavlovich, how did you get involved in the Malyshev case?"

"The trial was already in progress and the indictment was supported by Zimarin personally, but, out of the blue, he summoned me: 'You are instructed to conduct the prosecution. But bear in mind that I have talked with Moscow and recommended you as an honest man of principle....' I asked for time to study the case, and the more I examined it the more suspicious I became. I could not understand, for example why the indictment paid so much attention to Malyshev's school activities."

The "school case" was as follows. The investigation began looking for something "compromising" in Malyshev's career, starting from "square one," and discovered that he had been given the wrong mark for geography in the ninth grade. A special investigation was carried out which, I believe, took a lot of time and effort, and then, following a report by the prosecutor's office, Malyshev was deprived of his school leaving certificate and, accordingly, of his higher legal education diploma.

I drew the attention of newly appointed state prosecutor G.P. Shulyachenko to this strange episode.

"I asked Zimarin: What is the reason for this? I would be ashamed to raise the question at a trial. But he replied: 'Background...' I read on and on and found more and more of these 'background' facts. When I talked to Zimarin about it he reproached me: 'You are not acting in the public interest....' I said that acting in the public interest meant for me acting precisely according to the law. Finally, it was time for me to go to court. Zimarin's parting shot was: Everything will be all right; people are ready to do battle...."

"What people did he mean? False witnesses?"

Yes... It was the witnesses who made me doubt the role I had been assigned in the game. One witness appeared, a second, a third—and they read out their testimonies from scraps of paper. But when I took away their cribs they got confused and started talking nonsense...."

"Which of the witnesses surprised you most of all?"

"Zigelman... I knew he was one of the Odessa trade barons, but he was presented in the court as an ordinary longshoreman. I asked Zimarin about it. The answer was: 'It doesn't concern you.' How do you mean it doesn't concern me? I knew that criminal proceedings had been instituted against Zigelman, that he was on the run, that a countrywide search for him had been embarked on, and, suddenly, there he was at liberty, in the room, as the main witness! What about his own criminal case?... I couldn't understand it...."

"During the trial, did you feel you were getting a lot of attention?"

"Colleagues of Bobovskiy were there all the time and they watched my every reaction to what was happening at the trial. But I continued to report to Zimarin on how things were going. But later I stopped. The further we got into the trial the more I realized that someone was having a very big influence on the proceedings.... It was then that I decided to call to court the people who had been investigating the matter. Zimarin had me in to see him: 'What do you think you are doing?' I replied: I am doing what the law requires me to do.... OK, from now on, cool it...."

"Did you decide to drop the charge?..."

"I decided to support the attorney's application.... Zimarin summoned me. His deputies were there with him in the office. 'What do you intend to do?'—'Submit the case for further investigation. In the circumstances I can see only one solution.' Then I heard: 'What do you think you are doing! I've already told Moscow that everything's OK.... So why don't you get your act together....' I started to explain but he rudely interrupted me. For more than 3 hours, I faced a sustained attack by my bosses, and I realized that if I did not change my mind I would not get out of the office."

"So you decided to abandon it?"

"No... But I told them I would. I did not sleep that night, I stood smoking on the balcony.... The next day I arrived at the court at 1345. When I said: 'The charge against Malyshev does not correspond to the actual facts established in court,' I caught Aleksey Feodosyevich Shevchenko, member of the Moldavian Supreme Court, giving me a sympathetic look...."

It is over a year since Moldavian Supreme Court member A.F. Shevchenko presided over the Malyshev trial.

"Do you remember the case?" I asked the judge when I met with him in Kishinev.

"I lost 6 kg during that trial. I had never had such a case before, and I hope I never have one again...."

A.F. Shevchenko said that when the Malyshev case was handed to the Moldavian SSR Supreme Court as a special commission (to give a semblance of objectivity), suspicion about the original interrogation immediately began to creep into his mind.

"For example?"

"According to Zigelman's confession, he had been bribing Malyshev for 3 years. But what relationship was there, I wondered, between a market worker (as he was officially described in the indictment) and the chief of the city OBKHSS? My doubts began to be confirmed at the trial. I wanted to ascertain whether Zigelman had been arrested or, as was officially established by the investigation, had given himself up—which, as is known, exempts him from criminal punishment. Yet he was being investigated not in connection with the Malyshev case, but on his own account! Where had he got to? We called internal affairs administration staffer Ulyanchenko. He said: No, I didn't arrest him! I called internal affairs administration deputy chief Podlinnyy. He said: Ulyanchenko arrested Zigelman. I brought them back together. One said yes, the other said no. I couldn't stand it any longer: 'Comrades, you are senior police officers! Shame on you...'"

So the judges were suspicious that Zigelman might be a suborned witness. And that he was not the only one.

Here are extracts from the false witnesses' statements:

"I was at Gerber's place on my birthday. He told me that Malyshev was taking bribes. For example, Izya, manager of a liquor store, had given Malyshev money.... I had my doubts about what Gerber was saying. In 1985 I was questioned about it: Did I know Malyshev, had I been giving him bribes? I replied that I knew Malyshev, but I had never given him any money. Then they brought in Gerber, who had already been arrested, into the office and he asked me whether I recalled the conversation about Izya giving Malyshev money. I said no, I did not recall it.... Then I remembered that the conversation had taken place on my birthday. The comrade who was sitting in the office started to tell me what to write down" (witness Polishchuk).

"The statement that was read out had been written by me in Bobovskiy's office. I was under arrest for a long time, I was repeatedly interrogated by Bobovskiy, and I was placed in a situation where I wrote a statement and included in it facts which I knew nothing about and indicated the names of people who I did not know either" (witness Gerber).

And so on.

"The further the trial went, the more I realized I was present at some kind of show. Once, I remember, I asked Shulyachenko: 'Grigoriy Pavlovich, I would be interested to know what reasons you would give for your prosecution.' He did not reply at the time, but later...."

"You talk about the risk Shulyachenko was taking," I pressed the judge.

"Of course. The prosecutor's office is like the army. An order from the chief is the law as far as the subordinate is concerned. And he had disobeyed. We were saying goodbye once, when he said: 'Things are bad, Aleksey Feodosyevich. Bad...'"

I still have in my notebook G. P. Shulyachenko's account of how the day he disobeyed the order ended for him:

"The court had adjourned, but where was I to go? I phoned the deputy prosecutor and told him I had withdrawn the indictment. He said: 'No, I am not going to Zimarin with a report like that....' An hour later, I was at work. Zimarin's secretary said, without looking at me: 'Please wait, you will be called.' I wasn't called until half past six in the evening. I entered the office. Zimarin was there, slumped in his chair. The first thing he said was: 'You are no longer a departmnent chief.... You are no longer senior legal adviser.... I will do all I can to get you out of here.'"

G.P. Shulyachenko's fate was dramatic: He was soon relieved of his post, he was given a severe party reprimand, his record card being endorsed accordingly, and he was compelled literally to go into hiding in another city, paying infrequent visits to his family, walking the streets of his native Odessa warily as if in an alien environment, and listening tensely to clicking noises on the telephone.

The fate of N.V. Shashkin, investigator from Georgia, who signed the indictment against Malyshev, was quite different. Everything turned out fine, could not be better. Having spent 4 months in Odessa as leader of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigating team, he was promoted on returning to Tbilisi—he was appointed chief of the republic prosecutor's office administration supervising the conduct of criminal cases in the courts.

I feel bound to cite extracts from the dialogue with him which took place, at my request, in the presence of Georgian prosecutor V.A. Razmadze. I asked Shashkin what had made him write an indictment based on false documents. "I didn't write it...." came the unexpected reply. "I only signed it...." I reminded Shashkin that Malyshev had relied on him—a representative of Moscow, the center, the USSR Prosecutor's Office. He lowered his eyes: "What are you saying... Of course, I was

sent by Moscow... But in fact I am from Tbilisi!" I realized what he meant by this: "I am a small cog, I carry out orders, I am a little man" — so I did not ask any more questions.

Shashkin had played the game and it was appreciated. In Tbilisi they say that he may go even higher soon.

What a story!... At a distance it is a delight to the eye: There it is, the fresh breath of the times! There it is, the long-awaited spring! There it is—true restructuring! But that is at a distance!... When you get closer you discover with horror that it is not a new landscape at all, but a mass of decoration all hastily stuck together and splashed with paint, which is meant to represent the spring, the breath of the times, and restructuring.

Anyone encountering the Malyshev case for the first time was convinced that he was a criminal. Even later—after the sensational evidence by the investigators at the trial, after the surprise speech by the state prosecutor, and after the Moldavian SSR Supreme Court had sent the case to the USSR Prosecutor's office in Moscow for further investigation.

"It was all pressure on us: His position, his meteoric rise, his connections—A.I. Kondratov, senior investigator in the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigation section, frankly admitted.

It took 6 months of painstaking work, trips to dozens of cities, and another 21 (!) volumes of documentary material for the story to acquire the clarity that enables A.I. Kondratov to say today: Malyshev is not guilty.

"Anatoliy Ivanovich," I asked, "when did you realized the case was a fabrication?"

"We gradually came to that conclusion. On 3 August we confiscated the record sheet of the prosecutor's office vehicle that had brought Zigelman from Tiraspol after his arrest. You remember the name from the case?"

"Yes, of course.... One of the main 'witnesses.'"

"Apparently, the date on the sheet was identical to another date: when, according to the scenario, Zigelman allegedly gave himself up at the oblast prosecutor's office. A few days later the investigation of him (an official countrywide search for him had been under way for nearly a year!) was halted."

"What does that indicate?"

"A deal between the law-enforcement organs and the criminal. The next day, 4 August, I was forced to officially interrogate the oblast prosecutor."

That was that, it seemed. On 14 August, 2 days before his second anniversary in jail, A.V. Malyshev was released. Two months later, in October, he brought to the editorial offices the order dismissing the criminal case against him "for want of evidence that a crime had taken place."

And that's that. That is not that, of course!

I am convinced that those who are responsible for fabricating the Malyshev case will be punished. Something else needs to be examined now: What made the guilty guilty. And not at some time in the "stagnant" past. Now, in our day—between 1985 and 1987.

A.V. Malyshev is not a truth-loving hero rebelling against stagnant surroundings or being destroyed by those around him (how many heroes like that have passed before our eyes in the newspapers in the past two years). He is more victim than hero. But here is what I am thinking right now... What would have happened if Malyshev had gone along with Zimarin's and Bobovskiy's suggestions to "spread" to others the bribes that were being ascribed to him? How many more victims would there have been? How long then—not 2 years, but, perhaps, entire decades—would it have taken a new honest laywer to unravel the web of cunning machinations?

Perhaps not only in Odessa but other places too bribes have been "spread" in the same way, ensuring freedom for some and honor and glory for others?

I think that Zimarin and Bobovskiy would have gotten their medals for Malyshev alone. They have already earned public recognition in Odessa: Didn't they expose the OBKHSS chief!?.. And for the others, to whom Malyshev was merely a pawn, a plaything? Orders, at least?

I am convinced that the leaders of the Odessa law-enforcement organs were thinking about how to hasten their announcement of restructuring when they feverishly reported to their Moscow leaders: A mafia has been exposed! We demand protection against the pressure! Place the investigation under Moscow control! It's only the start! The start! The start!

That is, what they were saying was true and correct (how much work has been wrecked by local influence!), but there were base interests lurking behind the correct words. The new slogan:" "Down With Corruption!" was a front for old, long-condemned methods: Denunciation, blackmail, anonymous letters.

They hollered about a mafia, but were in fact serving it. Yes, serving it!... How many examples are there in the Malyshev case! Some trade barons had their stolen property returned to them, others had their terms of

punishment illegally reduced, criminal cases were quashed, in other cases the people in prisoners got the kind of food only foreign visitors to the city, and not all of them, knew about.

And all because Malyshev was "exposed."

In fact, as "market director" you are not accountable. As far as "restructuring" is concerned, it is a trivial matter. Yet he...

What a story!... There is so much of everything in it. Public demand for more and more victims which people like Zimarin have a nose for (one could write reams showing that arrests in themselves are no cure for social plagues). Speculation in new slogans to achieve personal aims.

There is something else I want to talk about. Working in Odessa, as I do, I could not help recalling, of course, the story I worked on some years ago there—the dramatic fate of former Odessa shipping line Komsomol organizer Nikolay Rozovaykin. A very, very similar story: The trip to Moscow "for the truth," the fabrication of the criminal case, the arrest: on that occasion, before the visit to the Komsomol, Central Committee, on this occasion after the meeting at the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, and the handcuffs (I often wondered whether they might not be the same handcuffs). But with one difference. When Malyshev listed the names of the various ranks of leaders who would be featuring (at the behest of the organizers of the masquerade) in future criminal cases, I was amazed to see that I knew nearly all of them. I knew them! From that old story, in fact! The very people who, in 1982, had placed a barrier in the way of publication of the article "After the Storm," using threats, blackmail, and slander. The very people who, when the article nevertheless appeared in the paper (not until January 1983), did all they could to suppress the story, which had such massive public repercussions, and discredit the hero of the article, the writer, and the paper.

They claimed that everything was perfectly OK in the republic and the city. I recall that when the paper prepared a special press bulletin for the leaders of the Ukrainian SSR on the gross violations of the rule of law in the republic (hundreds of horrific examples!), there came a formal reply: Not a single letter has been corroborated! I remember the readers' anger—ours too—when those responsible for taunting Nikolay ended up merely having had a slight scare.

I remember, as I replied to readers, feeling rather rattled: When would they put things right in Odessa.... I remember it, I remember it all.... Even the things I would rather not remember: surveillance in the streets of Odessa, the real threat of provocation, the arrest followed by the mysterious death of the person who had been helping the editorial board (at that time so long ago) to establish the truth.

I remember.... But somehow I did not feel any joy when, in the new Odessa story, I heard the list of names of people who just missed falling foul of the system which they had themslves once fostered. Who are they? They are now practically all has-beens. But who has replaced them? Who, hollering about restructuring, has simply taken over their traditions, as if putting the same old rattling motor in a spanking new automobile? In the hope that they will carry them through, as it carried them through before.... Over people! Living people!...

One episode in the story sticks in my mind. Grigoriy Pavlovich Shulyachenko went home. It was late. He had just received the order to "restructure." He understood that to mean: Tell the truth about the lies. He would be addresing the court the next day. He reckoned it would probably be his last speech. And he knew he had a choice.

Night came. He smoked cigarette after cigarette. He went out onto the balcony.... It was still night. Finally, he realized that he had no choice.

Would that we had more nights like that!...

P.S. The editorial board has learned that the USSR Prosecutor's Office collegium has devoted a special session to examining the Odessa story. The collegium reaffirmed A.V. Malyshev's innocence and it was decided to institute criminal proceedings in connection with the violation of the rule of law. The truth has triumphed, it would seem. But one sounds a note of caution. After the collegium session Zimarin returned to Odessa as if nothing had happened and continued his official functions—still as oblast prosecutor, that is, the official responsible for the observance of the socialist rule of law in one of the biggest oblasts in the Ukraine.

Is he hoping that he has escaped punishment? Or does he know that he has?...

'No Grounds for Complacency' on Drink

PM081145 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with Prosecutor General A.M. Rekunkov conducted by own correspondent P. Gutiontov: "There Can Be No Stopping"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Gutiontov] Aleksandr Mikhaylovich, may we start with a letter sent to the editorial office by N. Alekseyev, a Muscovite: "It seems to me," he writes, "that the colossal lines we see outside liquor stores today are virtually the only result of the 'struggle against drunkenness.' People just go on drinking as before, and perhaps the only difference between today and 3 years back is that it is less open...." I will not say that such letters are in the majority, but we do receive them and they have been increasing in number of late....

[Rekunkov] First, I firmly disagree with the assessment of the results. The most obvious of the results is a considerable reduction in crime in the country, and its link with the measures adopted against drunkenness is indisputable. Suffice it to say that until still quite recently, almost half of all crimes were committed by people who were in a state of intoxication, whereas this year it is one-fifth. Road accidents caused by drunk drivers have come down by one-third. Drunkenness has been substantially removed from the work place, and labor and manufacturing discipline has consequently been tightened up. A large number of chronic alcoholics, who literally terrorized their families and created an unhealthy atmosphere in public places, have been detected and called to account. Young people are drinking less alcohol and the number of people who have cut down on their drinking of alcohol or stopped drinking altogether has in general shown a substantial increase. And I'm sure you will agree that the fact that the number of divorces has also decreased can be linked to this too....

That is to say, all the negative phenomena linked with drunkenness have decreased to some degree. We are on the right track.

[Gutiontov] In other words, our reader has no grounds for alarm at all?

[Rekunkov] Not quite. And I would not want to limit myself today just to enumerating successes and achievements. It is far more useful, I think, to soberly assess, in the full sense of that term, the difficulties which we have already met and which we will unavoidably continue to meet. The point is that in the struggle against drunkenness we have only experienced the first and, as practice has shown, easiest stage. A new, much more complicated and crucial stage has now arrived: We have only removed the superficial features, and it is essential that we now go on and remove the actual roots of drunkenness through painstaking, purposeful action. And we do not yet see here the fervor that really determined all our recent successes. Very often it all amounts to nothing more than proscriptive and administrative measures, which are far from being enough now, and public influence has fallen way behind and lost its former rhythm and drive.

First, drunkenness has again begun to appear at the work place, particularly where the struggle against it was just a routine campaign, where reports were delivered and everything fell back into the old rut born of the time of stagnation. Here are some figures: Some 250,000 cases of drinking at the work place have been recorded this year (which is not yet over!). For purposes of comparison, there were 117,000 cases last year. A more than twofold increase!

[Gutiontov] But perhaps we've simply becoming more exacting, whereas before not all such incidents received publicity....

[Rekunkov] Unfortunately, there are no grounds for such thinking. Moreover, the most flagrant violations of production discipline are most often covered up and a conciliatory attitude to drunkenness and the actual wrongdoers is digging deeper and deeper roots. In Kirov Oblast, for example, 452 antidrunkenness commissions have been set up at enterprises, but not a single case of breach of antialcohol legislation has been "detected" in 18 months, although in reality the situation there is highly alarming. In Vologda, Sakhalin, Leningrad, and Vinnitsa Oblasts virtually every check finds cases where violators of antialcohol legislation are not only never brought to book but are given bonuses and other privileges.

Other examples can be cited, of course. For instance, there has not been a single case recorded of anyone appearing drunk at the Rustavi metallurgy plant. The prevention of such phenomena at the Tyumen engine plant named for the 50th anniversary of the USSR and many other enterprises has been well-organized. But such experience is being publicized and, what is most important, introduced very slackly.

[Gutiontov] But you will agree, after all, Aleksandr Mikhaylovich, that drinking at work is nevertheless already becoming an exceptional phenomenon....

[Rekunkov] I would not say so; that would be self-deception. Another factor that has to be taken into account is that drunkenness is increasingly shifting indoors—within the family or inside hostels. And it is no coincidence that it is precisely here that the number of serious drink-related crimes has as yet shown no diminution. It should be said that there are many shortcomings in the work of the law-enforcement agencies here: Quite often workers in the militia, prosecutor's office, and courts do not pay attention to the reports and statements made by citizens and as a result prompt measures are not taken against rowdies and people who will not leave their families or neighbors in peace. There is a lack of glasnost in preventive work.

In many cities law-enforcment agencies are now restructuring their work, giving pride of place to prevention. Monitoring on the part of the MVD and the USSR Prosecutor's Office of incoming alarm signals and the results of on-the-spot checks has been stepped up. But, you know, the efforts of law-enforcement agencies alone are not enough to beat drunkenness. Constant joint action between law-enforcment agencies and various public organizations, labor collectives, and local soviets are necessary.

At the moment, however, one has to say that things are not going well. Tens of thousands of letters sent by law enforcement agencies to enterprise leaders about the drunkenness of members of their collectives produce no reaction at all. In the RSFSR this year, for example, enterprise leaders deemed it unnecessary to answer two-thirds of such letters.... How deeply a conciliatory,

passive attitude to drunkenness has penetrated thinking is graphically shown by the results of a recent piece of sociological research: Sixty percent of workers polled at enterprises in Ivanovo Oblast and Borisov city consider that members of their labor collectives will not take active measures to punish work comrades for drunkeness because, first, they feel "sorry" for them, second, they are not blameless themselves, and third, they do not feel that it is somehow their business. That is to say, initially, when it was a question of struggling against "drunkenness in general," they were all in favor, but now, when the struggle is against specific drunkards....

I speak about this to stress once again that we are up against a formidable adversary: He has long-standing "traditions" behind him, and there are no grounds for slacking off or complacency. Much less for pinning hopes on the effectiveness of proscriptive and administrative measures alone.

[Gutiontov] It is becoming clear now that many people were relying on such measures alone. But it would seem that the most "resolute" and "radical" measures proved the least effective....

[Rekunkov] Yes. There have been instances of zealous administrators' sending militia detachments to weddings to check that there was no alcohol being served. Of course, it would be better if the wedding guests actually preferred tea to vodka, but you cannot forcibly impose a sober way of life, especially not in such an unacceptable form.

Nor can it be considered normal when long lines form outside wine and liquor stores—lines which the speculator or even the unscrupulous trade worker has managed to exploit.

Or take the sobriety zones—they are a very good initative. However, an investigation has shown that very often they were created (or, more accurately, announced) without the appropriate socioeconomic or ideological support and amounted to nothing more than a restriction on the sale of wine and vodka. What was the result? Here is just one example: In Smolensk Oblast's Pochinkovskiy Rayon, which was declared a sobriety zone, 1,500 people were registered in the first 6 months of this year as having broken the antialcohol law. Indeed, this is more than in the oblast's other rayons which are not sobriety zones....

[Gutiontov] And here is another very important question: moonshining.

[Rekunkov] That is almost the greatest question today. The sale of wine and vodka products has been halved but that reduction has almost been "compensated" for by moonshining. Moreover, home production has ceased to be the exclusive affair of people in rural localities: Around 40% of such offences are committed in cities. It is particularly alarming that the moonshiner's social background has changed. It is no longer only antisocial and parasitic elements who speculate in moonshine and alcohol—increasingly it is pensioners and housewives, trade workers, hotel and restaurant staff, and long-distance train crews who are becoming involved in this "activity."

Last May, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium made substantial amendments to the existing law and this made it possible to sharply step up the work of exposing moonshining and nip it in the bud: for example, five times more moonshiners have been prosecuted this year than in 1985.

You will agree that this fact fully characterizes the scale of the campaign mounted against moonshining in the country. But this is not enough. Suffice it to say that when fining a large number of people for producing moonshine not intended for sale, militia workers often fail to check whether these decisions are actually enforced. As a result offenders go unpunished. The law enforcement organs are now working primarily to expose the ringleaders and organizers of moonshine production and sale and the most rigorous measures provided by the law will be taken against them, including an additional punishment in the form of confiscation of property. But it must be said quite clearly that this social evil can only be thoroughly eradicated when we are able to create around moonshiners an atmosphere of true social intolerance, hostility, and condemnation—with the broadest publicity of the measures taken. There must be more frequent open trials of moonshiners and they must be reported in the press. It is time to realize that moonshining (like drunkenness in general) hits society as a whole and each of us individually. And when the moonshiner sells a bottle we pay him, figuratively speaking, from our pocket, too. This can be calculated quite accurately just by looking at the sharp increase in the "consumption" of sugar for the production of moonshine.

[Gutiontov] Surely we have a right to rely on the sobriety society activists here. You are not dissatisfied with their activity?

[Rekunkov] Unfortunately, I am. Instead of doing their utmost to promote cultural and educational work among the population, to support and develop useful initiatives to ensure a healthy way of life (which, in fact, was why the all-union struggle for sobriety society was created), many of its organizations often simply go through the basic formalities. Strenuous efforts are made to create the semblance of a mass movement, various types of information are collected, and reports are written on the work done by other organs in the struggle against drunkenness. But in actual fact, the range of social formations waging this struggle is very narrow. All the work of soviet ispolkom commissions and sobriety societies is being done by individuals. But the fact is that drunkenness remains a broadly-based, deep-rooted phenomenon and we are trying to destroy it with forces which are small in number and uncoordinated.

We must not tire or complain of being tired. We cannot simply point to the obstacles and give up. The obstacles must be removed and, thus, the causes of those hindrances must be found and combated most energetically.

Having achieved such impressive initial results in the struggle against drunkenness, it would simply be a crime to turn back or even just to stand still. There can be no stopping.

Customs Buys Sophisticated Foreign Equipment

PM080849 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 3

[NOVOSTI correspondent A. Dyubin special report for IZVESTIYA under the rubric "Exhibitions": "Attention: Contraband!"]

[Text] The hardened criminal N., who had robbed a jeweller's store earlier and then had hidden with the loot, was sitting in front of customs officials in total confusion. During an inspection at a Soviet border crossing, the customs officials, without taking apart his car, without even opening his suitcase or asking him to take off his jacket, had discovered all his contraband caches. Even those located in the doors and other not easily accessible cavities on the car. And those hidden under the false bottom of his suitcase. And even the diamonds which he had swallowed after packing them in special plastic bags.

During the investigation, the criminal's last hope that he had nonetheless managed to ship part of the loot abroad collapsed. The smuggler was confronted with a package which he had mailed earlier and which, as N. believed, only he was able to unpack safely since it contained a bandit "surprise"—a plastic bomb.

It is perhaps time to admit that there was no N., and no loot. I was watching how contraband caches in the most unlikely places are discovered at an international exhibition "Instruments and Equipment for Customs Inspections" which ended in Moscow recently.

This was the first such exhibition held in our country. It was organized by an exhibition company "Novea International" (FRG) and the USSR Council of Ministers Main Administration for State Customs Inspections. "Novea International"—its director general in Moscow is D. Bastian—is a leading foreign firm for the organization of international exhibitions in the USSR.

Most of the exhibition participants already have experience in long-term and mutually advantageous cooperation with our country. They have been supplying medical and other equipment and, as of late, also technical equipment to combat smuggling.

The Belgian firm "Balto Schlumberger" [name as published] has been selling equipment for nondestructive inspections to the Soviet Union for more than 15 years. As long ago as 1975, and before the Moscow Olympics, the firm started supplying x-ray equipment to Soviet customs authorities for the inspection of suspect packages and luggage. At the exhibition, the firm demonstrated more sophisticated equipment full of electronic gadgets, which make it possible to record the inspection process, wholly or selectively, on video film.

The West German firm "Schtorts" [name as published], whose medical equipment has been used in Soviet clinics for more than a quarter of the century, has offered customs specialists and investigation and law enforcement organs a compact set of endoscopes for investigating inaccessible and dark cavities in cars, sea and river vessels, and railroad trucks and photographing the discovered objects. The Heimann [name as published] (FRG) company displayed handy portable x-ray scanning equipment (for cars).

An original invention is the x-ray and television apparatus developed by the British "Astrophysics" and "Indepth Systems Limited" companies, which identifies organic and inorganic susbstances in baggage (including narcotics). If necessary, a sharply defined 2- or 3-dimensional monochrome or color image of the objects in the luggage can be projected on a VDU screen. K. Lokiyer and M. Robins [names as puiblished], who were representing these companies, said that their equipment had been bought by Aeroflot this year.

"This exhibition was extremely useful for all concerned," V. Draganov, deputy chief of the USSR Council of Ministers Main Administration for State Customs Inspections, said. "Although our customs authorities are equipped with basic technical means of inspection, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology is developing in cooperation with the USSR Academy of Sciences and the relevant ministries and departments sophisticated means to enhance the effectiveness and standard of customs inspections. We have also been allocated essential funds for the purchase of the most up-to-date foreign inspection equipment."

Kiev Oblast Party Meetings Criticized

PM101025 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87
First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent M. Odinets: "Formalism on the Rostrum; Why the Holding of Meetings With Reports on Restructuring Had To Be Suspended"]

[Excerpt] Kiev Oblast—[Passage omitted] When the primary party organization of the Kievo-Svyatoshinskiy Rayon meat processing combine decided to hold a meeting with a party bureau report, they did not think that it had to be carefully prepared, that the report had to be compiled in as keen and interesting a way as possible, and that they had to talk with many Communists beforehand. And here was party bureau secretary A. Pochenkov on the rostrum. The superficial report,

devoid of analysis or thorough criticism, left the audience indifferent. It moved no one and touched no one. It was difficult to ascertain from the report exactly how the party bureau is influencing restructuring in the collective. That is why the speeches were also banal and suitable for any purpose, as they say. The majority of speakers did not manage to assess how the party bureau was working. And although the bureau contains people who are obviously failing to cope with their duties no one raised his voice to be rid of them.

The Kiev party obkom decided to study the reason for the failures of meetings of this kind. This was done in 13 of the oblast's rayons after the first rounds, and here is what emerged. In a number of cases, the party organization leaders are ignoring democratic forms like requests from the party committees and party bureaus to all Communists and to the collective to make proposals and comments on the work of the elected organ and the preliminary discussion of reports in shop party organizations and party groups. For instance, in preparing meetings with party bureau reports the Vasilkov leather association and the Fastov consumer services combine "forgot" to involve the aktiv and to consult with the Communists the day before. The result? [as published] And the report at the Belichskiy stoneworking plant did not say a single word about work under the conditions of democratization and glasnost or about the Communists' role in implementing economic reform.

Generalizing the observations accumulated, the Kiev party obkom workers noted that some reports reveal a desire to bypass urgent issues, to avoid naming specific culprits, to "sweeten" criticism, and to blunt it. And that sets the tone for the debates, which in a whole series of cases are characterized not by openness and broad initiative but by a tendency toward reporting only on one's own work, toward general discussions about everything and nothing. An atmosphere is created in which rank and file Communists are afraid of making just complaints against leaders and display a lack of resolve. Nor are mutual exactingness and principled demandingness very much in evidence.

The following example draws attention to itself: This year the number of cases of absenteeism doubled compared with last year and the number of workers who had visited the sobering up station trebled at the Belaya Tserkov "Stroyindustriya" combine. The meeting mentioned this in passing and the decision instructed the bureau member in charge of this sector of work: "... Take every measure to activate the combine's public organizations."

A passive attitude toward bungling secretaries and party committee and bureau members who perform their responsible assignments in a mediocre manner is to be observed during meetings. This leniency and lack of principledness made themselves felt at the oblast Potrebsoyuz party meeting, for instance. Last summer party organization secretary N. Nosik was relieved of his duties here for gross blunders in his work. It would seem that during the report he would have been removed from the elected organ, especially as he was still working badly. But with tacit consent he was left on the party bureau.

The repetition of old methods of holding them is common to many meetings: excessive organization, conventional reports, a bombastic style in the speeches leaning toward the economic aspect, the absence of impartial constructive criticism, and general, meaningless decisions with calls to "intensify," "enhance," and "expand." There is little openness, glasnost, or healthy dissatisfaction with what has been achieved at these meetings. Yet that is precisely what is required by the CPSU Central Committee resolution and the recommendations expressed at the conference in the party Central Committee.

Having studied the experience of holding the first rounds of meetings, the Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom has decided to suspend their holding where the party committees and bureaus are not prepared for reports. It has been recommended that the party gorkoms and raykoms return to the meeting which took place formally and make the party organization secretaries and party committee representatives who attended them strictly answerable for the poor standard of their preparation. The obkom bureau deemed it necessary to send obkom, gorkom, and raykom workers to local areas to render practical assistance and to enlist a broad aktiv to this work. During meetings it has been proposed to give everywhere a principled, objective assessment of the activity of secretaries and members of party committees and bureaus. The obkom demands that people proceed more resolutely in removing from the elected organs those party members who are not coping with their duties.

'Pseudopacifist' Group's Anti-Sovietism

PM091539 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 First Edition p 3

[V. Pustov article: "Forgery. How a Group Calling Itself 'Trust' Disseminates a Malicious Lie"]

[Text] From the earliest times, people have said: "Lies have short legs."

"But why do they need legs?" our external and internal (let us not close our eyes to them) enemies, who have become skilled at disseminating forgeries, aver. "In the present age of the scientific and technical revolution, other means will be found which can quickly carry from one end of the world to the other any lie or slander, calumny, fabrication, or anything else that contradicts the truth."

The initiators of the group which calls itself "Trust" are guided by just such a "philosophy" when they organize an anti-Soviet orgy, now in one part of Moscow, now in

another. They disseminate cock-and-bull stories, speculating on the peoples' desire to put an end to confrontation, remove the threat of war, and strengthen peace and international security. In this the falsifiers are gambling on the heightened interest in them on the part of representatives of the Western press who do not disdain slander, however crudely it is presented, and who are ready to pass it on through all channels of modern communication.

One of "Trust's" recent malicious actions was the dissemination of a so-called "open letter in defense of Lev Krichevskiy." It is malicious and anti-Soviet, and every line is a lie. Forgive me, reader, for quoting at length from it, but this is necessary. The truth demands accuracy. The letter's authors allege with feigned indignation that Lev Krichevskiy was drafted for military service "in defiance of all medical evidence and laws." That he "refused to take the oath and fulfill military duties"—for which he was first subjected to "massive pressure" and was then "repeatedly placed under arrest, where he was kept in the cold without warm clothing, normal food, or a place to sleep, being forced to sleep on the concrete floor."

The imagination of the authors of the "open" forgery ran riot and suggested to them that "privates and junior commanding officers had been stirred up" against L. Krichevskiy and had "beaten him up." And that, as a sign of protest, he had declared an "indefinite hunger strike" which had "lasted 51 days and was forcibly interrupted when Krichevskiy was already unconscious."

In conclusion, the undersigned I. and A. Krivov, Ye. Derbyanskaya, R. Aronova, A. Lashchiver, and others, as is their wont, theatrically protest and, of course, demand "punishment for the guilty persons."

But the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA editorial office has received another letter—from Lev Yuryevich Krichevskiy himself, a private in a military unit. He reports that he had once been a member of the "Trust" group but that now his name and his service in the armed forces, which he is doing in accordance with the Law on Compulsory Military Service, are being used for speculative purposes by pseudofighters for the ideas of pacifism. Lev Krichevskiy asks the editors to intervene and demands: "...End the slander campaign unleashed around my name for improper purposes and take measures against the initiators of this campaign."

Naturally, I wanted to meet with L. Krichevskiy. And there I was in the headquarters of a military unit. A solidly built—as people say—soldier came in, with a smiling face and without a hint of tension in his eyes. He introduced himself: Private Krichevskiy. I began the conversation with a traditional question: "What is service like, soldier?"

"All right," he answered, "as it is for everyone. I work in the unit's club, and I am studying to be a movie technician."

Krichevskiy spoke briefly about himself: He had secondary education, is a Komsomol member, has been in the Army since 1986, and took the oath. He has been honestly fulfilling his military duty for a year and is sure that he will also serve the remaining year equally honestly.

I listed literally point by point all the slander with which the "open letter" in his "defense" is saturated. He shrugged his shoulders. Nothing even remotely of the kind had happened at all, he said. He felt well physically, and morally too. He had no complaints either about the commanding officers, or about his comrades in service, or about the burdens of military service itself. He was indignant at the "Trust" group's forgery and had not provided any grounds for its fabrication.

I talked with his immediate chief: No complaints about the soldier. Nor did his comrades in service say anything bad about him.

So what is going on? What can account for the mean trick—there is no other word for it—perpetrated by "Trust's" pseudopacifists? The answer suggests itself of its own accord: to put it mildly, malevolence toward our motherland. It is impossible not to notice that this group's actions, which are built on utter lies, slander, and forgery, have something in common with the basic postulates of anti-Soviet propaganda in the West. Contrary to the truth, people there stubbornly maintain that the USSR possesses superiority in armed forces and conventional arms and must therefore, they say, reduce them unilaterally. Here, too, attempts are made under the flag of false pacifism to incite young people to violate the honorable duty of Soviet citizens enshrined in our Constitution—military service in the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces. Both there and here people act hypocritically by expatiating on "the establishment of East-West trust" while in fact trying to undermine our strength without which the strategic stability which is so essential to the world is inconceivable. Both there and here people sow poisoned seeds of suspicion and mistrust toward the Soviet Union's constructive, peace-loving policy.

This is not the first time the provocateurs of the group which, as though in mockery of common sense, has appropriated the noble name "Trust" have been found guilty of lies, mean tricks, and other dirty deeds. Having covered themselves with ignominy, they cannot reckon on the trust of Soviet citizens.

Spotlight on Ufa's Serious Pollution Problem

PM091505 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Dec 87 First Edition p 6

[Special correspondent M. Merzabekov report: "Ecological Situation. This Is What the Deputies Decided"]

[Text] Ufa—A session of the city soviet took place in Ufa the other day. A deputy's inquiry about the ecological situation in the city and the construction of a polycarbonate plant was examined. The session approved a program of priority measures to improve the environment, a program compiled with consideration for citizens' opinions, and also decided to ask the USSR Council of Ministers for the polycarbonate plant construction zone to be moved outside the city.

This notice, which we quote almost verbatim, has only just been printed in VECHERNYAYA UFA. Events which have assumed an acute nature lurk behind this brief report.

Not so long ago, if you talked about the industrial face of Ufa, there was invariably a reference to the fact that it is a major center for the petroleum refining, petrochemical, and chemical industries. Indeed, a unique concentration of the sector: three oil refineries, one for synthetic spirit, plus the whole "Khimprom" association. And all this is concentrated in the city's one industrial region. Come wind or calm there forms over Ufa a barely visible bluish haze made up of a multitude of ingredients which, to put it mildly, do not contribute to people's health.

For a certain time it was not done to talk aloud about air, water, and soil pollution in and around Ufa. Data from monitoring organs showing that, for a number of toxic substances, the maximum permitted concentration of pollution was being exceeded many times over remained a secret closely guarded from the public. But the winds of glasnost brought their purifying breath to this "polluted" sector also.

Last July's session of the Bashkir ASSR Supreme Soviet, which discussed the status of and measures to improve nature protection, was the first real step toward a frank and objective assessment of the ecological situation in the autonomous republic and its capital. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA talked about this in the article "Time To Stop!" (21 July 1987). Today I believe it is necessary to return to the individual speeches at the session.

This is what A.S. Yurin, second secretary of Ufa CPSU Gorkom, said:

"The prevailing practice in the city of constructing new capacities and operating existing ones without effectively resolving environmental protection issues has led to pollution of the atmosphere, soil, and reservoirs. The concentration of harmful substances exceeds permitted norms and there is no trend toward a reduction. An unfavorable ecological situation has been maintained in Ufa for many years and has become an acute social problem for its inhabitants. Back in 1981, the directive organs decided to ban the construction, and the expansion by means of new construction, of industrial enterprises in Ufa. However, a decision has been taken in violation of this resolution and despite the city's categorical objections to construct a major polycarbonate plant as part of the "Khimprom" association...."

Now let us turn to the speech by A.Kh. Turyanov, Bashkir ASSR minister of health:

"The incidence of disease, especially among children, in areas of increased air pollution is higher than in controlled rayons. In view of the situation which has taken shape, Ufa's sanitation service organs firmly object to the placing of the polycarbonate plant in the city."

Thus, it was said in plain terms: The limit of environmental pollution in the city has been reached and additional construction of chemical enterprises which complicate the situation is inadmissible. The residents of Ufa received the results of the session with confidence and hope.

Nevertheless, the news was soon out that it had been decided all the same to construct the polycarbonate plant within the city limits and that the preparation of the zone had already begun. Something else also emerged: There had also been a change in the position of certain leaders. Categorical objections to placing the new chemical plant have been replaced by assertions that it "can be built" and even that "it is necessary to build it".... At that time in Ufa, there appeared people collecting the signatures of those opposed to this construction. The discussion got splash coverage in the newspapers; television "roundtables" were held with the participation of a CPSU obkom secretary, the party gorkom first secretary, Council of Ministers deputy chairmen, the gorispolkom chairman, the USSR deputy minister for the production of mineral fertilizers, the sector's leading staff specialists, and leaders of the autonomous republic's ministries and departments. Bashkir television had never known such representative "roundtables." In view of how hot the subject was, the entire republic followed the programs. As for their persuasiveness... Officials, seemingly reaching agreement, assured viewers that there were no grounds for alarm. V.V. Lapikov, chief of the Hydrometeorology and Enviromental Monitoring Administration, claimed in defiance of the obvious that the ecological situation in Ufa was stabilizing. I.K. Mironenko, chairman of the Bashkir ASSR Gosplan, expressed himself to the effect that "chemophobia" stems from a lack of information. And he resolved to convince people, as he said, with the "impartial language of figures," announcing that of the enterprises sited here in the last 5 years only 5% are chemical enterprises. But this "language of figures" is not at all convincing. Even the 5% of chemical enterprises outweigh the remaining 95% in terms of the force of their harmful ecological impact.

Nor did the people of Ufa accept the "diplomatic" zigzags of A.Kh. Turyanov, the republic's health minister. In response to "direct line" questions about the impact of pollution on the incidence of disease, Alfred Khabibovich preferred to discourse "on an all-Russian

scale" rather than that of the city's industrial zone, which especially suffers from pollution, and essentially he avoided giving an answer. The contrast between his speech as a deputy at the republic's Supreme Soviet session 4 months ago and his present role as "roundtable" participant, a contrast between diametrically opposed utterances, is striking.

It was easy to predict the results of such a "discussion"—only supporters of construction were given the floor. But their opponents, of whom there are many and who wield weighty arguments, had no opportunity to express themselves in public. The truth could only be clarified by means of an impartial analysis of all the arguments and a scientific assessment of all the "pros" and "cons." Both laying it on excessively thick and fanning passions, and cheerful assurances that there is almost the clearest of skies over Ufa are equally harmful for an objective examination of the question.

It is sufficient to acquaint ourselves with the document "Assessment of the State of Environmental Pollution by the Ufa "Khimprom" production association." The document was signed by Doctor of Technical Sciences Prof R.M. Masagutov, director of the Research Institute of Petrochemical Industries; A.P. Vinkelman, chief of the Bashkir ASSR State Inspection for Atmospheric Protection; N.A. Pavlova, chief of the Environmental Pollution Monitoring Center; Doctor of Technical Sciences Prof V.D. Simonov, director of the All-Union Herbicides Scientific Research Technological Institute; Doctor of Technical Sciences Prof D.F. Varfolomeyev, director of the Bashkir Oil Refining Research Institute; V.N. Yaroslavtsev, deputy chief physician at the Ufa City Sanitation and Epidemiological Center; Doctor of Medical Sciences L.M. Karamova, director of the Institute of Hygiene and Occupational Diseases, and N.P. Khrulev, chief of Ufa's Kamskoye Basin Administration Chemical Hydrology Laboratory. Here are the conclusions reached by the authoritative commission: "Recently, levels in excess of the permitted maximum have consistently been registered in the city's residential zone, pollutants specific to the "Khimprom" production association. Effective concentrations of harmful substances in Ordzhonikidzevskiy Rayon's residential zone stably exceed the maximum permitted concentration. The increased level of atmospheric pollution in the residential zone adjacent to the "Khimprom" production association is one of the main reasons for the high incidence of disease. The construction of a polycarbonate plant will lead to additional dangerous environmental pollution by a series of toxic agents, including those whose maximum permitted concentrations have not been formulated. Furthermore, the allotted area contravenes the requirements of construction norms and regulations."

Can we brush aside such assessments?

Yes we can, it would appear. Even different commission members could not be completely consistent. Speaking on television, D.F. Varfomoleyev, director of the Bashkir Oil Refining Research Institute, persuaded the people of Ufa that even under laboratory conditions scientists dealing with harmful substances do not feel their harmful effect.

It is as if some force made respected people affirm one thing in the beginning and 3-4 months later—something completely opposite.

Now let us talk about the area chosen for the building. Not only is it located within the city. There are also other serious flaws. This is what Yu.A. Kornev, chief of a department at the Bashkir "Promstroyproyekt" Institute, who has been tasked with designing part of the complex, said:

"I wrote an official note refusing to participate in the project. First, the area is very karstic. We need to provide for mighty concrete 'cushions' under almost every structure, which will cost, according to approximate estimates, roughly an additional R15 million. But such engineering insurance does not guarantee us against karstic 'surprises.' Second, the proximity of the water table and Shugurovka River puts them under threat of direct pollution. And lower down the system is the Ufa River and the site of the city's water intake. But people do not want to take this into consideration either. Furthermore, they are trying in every way with the aid of systematic subterfuges to reduce the indicators for future pollution...."

The opinions of those specialists who objected to the chosen spot were viewed almost as sabotage. Wittingly or no, all this exacerbated the situation.

On Sunday 29 November groups of Ufa residents took part in a rally at the city soviet building, where demands were heard for the construction of the polycarbonate plant in the city to be banned and for increased monitoring of the state of the environment. It had become still more obvious here that attempts to abandon open, timely, and honest discussion of acute questions and ignore the interests of the entire population are quite doomed.

But something else is just as obvious: Secrecy at times leads to spontaneous expressions of feelings on the squares which verges on hooliganism, as could indeed be seen in Ufa. Decisions must be weighed, substantiated, and adopted with consideration for a broad exchange of opinions which excludes strong-arm tactics, disrespect for opponents, and the labeling of dissidents.

The city soviet session made a fair decision in this situation. The deputies who spoke pointed out that a lack of glasnost generates distrust in leaders and creates conditions whereby different arrogant people manage to make capital out of the popular slogan of struggling for environmental protection. The complex ecological situation in the city did not emerge suddenly, but a great

deal of time and expense will be needed to bring the situation back to normal. But even today, the deputies stressed, we can perceptibly rectify the situation by boosting technological discipline at each workplace and stepping up monitoring by the forces of the inspection organs and the public. Such monitoring is greatly lacking. The role and authority of the nature protection society in Ufa is extremely low since no one takes it into account.... Speaking at the session, Deputy R.R. Mavlyutov, rector of the Aviation Institute, rightly condemned the practice whereby even in the soviets the nature protection commissions are led by the people who head those same enterprises which most pollute the environment. So, M.M. Kukovitskiy, chief of the "Bashneftekhimzavody" Territorial Association, is chairman of the Bashkir ASSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Nature Protection and Rational Use of Natural Resources. And the comparable standing commission in the city soviet is headed by... V.M. Rakitskiy, the chief technologist of this same association.

With all this drama, events in Ufa have served as a lesson in democratization. A difficult lesson. M.A. Zaytsev, chairman of the gorispolkom, a man new to this post, was right when he stated in conversation with your correspondent: "We still have to get used to a great deal in the democratization process which does not fit in with the old stereotypes." This fully applies also to the acute problem of improving the environment. Not only the people of Ufa but also the inhabitants of other cities and villages in the autonomous republic want to see their native territory clean, bright, healthy, and prosperous.

Rostov Lacks 'Politically Literate' Cadres

PM091525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent M. Kryukov report: "Everyone Must Work Harder"]

[Text] Rostov-na-Donu—Both the report delivered by Obkom First Secretary B. Volodin and the other speeches said that the state of affairs in Rostov Oblast is still no cause for joy. For many years now, there has been no success in achieving stable grain production. The store shelves are short of meat, butter, cheese, and other goods needed by people. The construction of housing, hospitals, and polyclinics is slow. True enough, this year they did manage, for the first time in many years, to just about fulfill the plan for grain sales to the state. They did manage for the first time to produce 560,000 tonnes of sunflowers. There has been hardly any—or very slight in places—acceleration of the pace. There has been some positive movement in several sectors. But only slight, and only a movement. And what is needed is a breakthrough. A sharp turn. So that a day's work is equivalent to 2 days' work. So that initiative and new approaches demolish the stagnation.

How do bureau members emerge from this situation? How are they guiding the processes of restructuring? It was on these questions that the plenum participants focused their attention.

For example, V. Ovchinnikov, first secretary of the Remontnenskiy party raykom, seriously reproached party Obkom Secretary V. Gubskiy. Ovchinnikov heads the party organization in one of the oblast's difficult eastern rayons. His rayon suffers from drought more often than others. The steppe has greatly changed in the last few decades. The rayon is forced to bring in feed from outside. This is expensive, troublesome, unreliable. It would seem that a sensible balance ought to be introduced between the headcount of livestock and the structure of sown areas. It could be possible to have a smaller but better and more productive herd. Otherwise, if we continue running affairs in the same way, as Ovchinnikov said, we will leave nothing but a desert for our offspring.

"Despite this," he went on, "party obkom bureau member Gubskiy demands that we start the year on 1 January with 500,000 sheep and not a single sheep less. And Vladimir Mikhaylovich is rather fond of repeating: 'Just to ensure that there is no stirring in the ranks on this account.'"

This is an example of the administrative edict style of leadership. A desire to impose one's will. But the choke points and problems, of which so many have accumulated within the agro-industrial complex, cannot be resolved either by edicts or by orders. It is necessary to consult people, to take their interests and their experience into consideration. When the obkom secretary ordains: "No stirring," then there really will be no stirring of initiative.

The oblast agro-industrial committee is headed by N. Kushnarenko, member of the CPSU Obkom Bureau. Officials within its apparatus still display considerable administrative zeal and superficiality. Nikolay Ivanovich has still not managed to organize matters in such a way as to achieve a substantial breakthrough in the agro-industrial complex's economic activity. The partners' work is not "properly orchestrated."

One of the very substantial causes of lagging in agricultural production was raised at the plenum by T. Zhuravleva, milkmaid from Kagalnitskiy Rayon's "Novobatayskiy" sovkhoz. As a matter of fact, Kushnarenko was first secretary of that rayon's party raykom a few years ago. The milkmaid spoke about the contract system. People first started talking about it while Kushnarenko was still secretary there. And what has changed in the meantime?

"We still have to see a proper, effective contract system, like the ones we read about in the papers or see on television," T. Zhuravleva said. "There is a lot of formalism in the performance of contract commitments

between administration and contracting collectives. For some unknown reason, the administration believes that it can avoid carrying out its commitments. And people are losing their faith in the new forms of labor organization. You, Nikolay Ivanovich, and all obkom bureau members must have a much more detailed knowledge of all the complexities involved in the introduction of collective contracts and must assist in overcoming them."

Tamara Nikolayevna is right. According to the lists in various returns, the oblast already has quite a few contracting collectives. But in reality? They often exist in a truncated form. They disintegrate before they take proper shape. How can anyone talk about promoting an "economic accountability [khozraschetnoye] mentality" among rural working people...?

CPSU Obkom Secretary A. Tyaglivyy was perhaps the target for the most arrows of criticism. He is in charge of the construction industry, which is chronically lame. The bureau report emphasized that the problem of capital construction is the real sore spot in the obkom's work. There is an impression that restructuring is bypassing this sector. The report said about A. Tyaglivyy that he has failed to abandon the excessive supervision of economic leaders and to enhance the responsibility of party committees for the state of political education work among construction site labor collectives. He does not always assess the situation critically, and he gives preference to the solution of technological questions rather than to people who ensure this solution.

The following was heard during the debate: "He comes, he reproaches, he promises, he leaves. Every time it's the same story. Get this right, Aleksandr Yegorovich. We don't need mentorship, we need help. It is, of course, necessary to worry about today's results, but one must not lose sight of the long-term prospect."

As a rule, the obkom secretary's work style is transmitted down the ladder. And so, first the obkom Construction Department, and then the gorkoms and raykoms make increasingly frequent use of the language of edicts when speaking to construction industry workers. They deal mainly with trust and administration leaders. They display little concern for the working and living conditions of construction industry workers.

Party Obkom Secretary N. Kravchenko, who is in charge of the oblast's energy complex, was also criticized at the plenum for supplanting economic leaders. Coal extraction this year fell by 350,000 tonnes below last year's level. At the same time, a sum of about R5 million in capital investment funds allocated for construction work in the sector has not been assimilated.

The question of bureau members' rights was raised at the plenum. They have considerable rights. They often have the final word as to who should occupy what position and what resolution should be adopted. This is a major responsibility. But what happens if rights are not fully used? The cause suffers. This was said about Oblispolkom Chairman N. Pivovarov. A. Taran, first secretary of the Tagangrog party gorkom, said in particular:

"In our view, Obkom Bureau Member Nikolay Dmitriyevich Pivovarov does not exercise the rights vested in him when solving many questions concerning housing construction and reduces his functions to nothing more than issuing instructions, and there is no strict monitoring of the fulfillment of instructions."

And so, the oblispolkom's work style is copied at local level. The problems of housing and road construction and of consumer goods manufacture are tackled with insufficient persistence and determination. The ispolkoms still play the role of petitioners to enterprises when it comes to solving questions of the comprehensive socioeconomic development of cities and rayons. And yet, Soviet power ought to be not a petitioner but a master! For the sake of the thousands and thousands of voters who are judging restructuring primarily in terms of actual results.

Party Obkom Second Secretary V. Suslin also lacks demandingness. Vitaliy Timofeyevich is in charge of industry. Not all workers in the sector are capable of critically assessing their work. Addressing V. Suslin, T. Tsapina, electric crane operator at the Sulinskiy metallurgical plant, said:

"You must be stricter in taking such leaders to task as regards the performance of assigned tasks." [Text] Yes, the excessive tolerance of which V. Suslin stands accused does not promote the cause. For several years now, no one has been held responsible for the comprehensive fulfillment of the resource-saving program. The oblast has failed to meet targets for savings in virtually all types of resources, while the shortage of raw and other materials is becoming more acute. The party obkom has already been seriously criticized for this by the CPSU Central Committee.

The reputation of Rostov Oblast and its party organization was justifiably "tarnished" in the past as a result of violations of the Leninist norms of party life. There were major failures in work with cadres. Trials of workers in trade, motor vehicle transport, and petroleum products enterprises gained notoriety. This was widely covered by the press and reported on television.

What has changed since then? Intensive cleansing work has been done. Party organs and departments have rid themselves of selfish and arrogant workers suffering from rickety consciences. This process is still going on. The last 2 years alone have seen the dismissal of 58 officials from the CPSU obkom staff.

But, as the plenum noted, things are far from well in cadre work. Insufficient use is made of the democratic forms for electing leaders. There is little glasnost in the

selection and placement of people. These questions are often decided by narrow circles. And if the horizon is narrow, it is only natural that fewer worthy people will be noticed. Eyes fall on "conventional" and suitable people, whose chief merit often is nothing but a clean record. The opinion of labor collectives is rarely tested. It is no accident that, out of 122 persons who have graduated from the frontline reserve school set up at the initiative of the party obkom bureau, only 27 have been promoted to the next level at work. People from outside the oblast had to be brought in to fill some senior positions. This practice is, of course, no credit to the obkom bureau.

Writer Anatoliy Kalinin spoke emotionally at the plenum:

"Unless we establish heart-to-heart contact with individuals, with the people, we will simply have no idea for whose sake restructuring is being carried out. We touched the heartstrings at the 27th party congress. And we heard what this heart had been yearning for and suffering for, for a long time."

Yes, restructuring is going on for the sake of man, for the sake of his well-being. It is important to perceive each step along its path in its human dimension. Report figures are not needed for their own sake. Their purpose is the most humanitarian of all—to reflect how man lives, whether his table is well laden, whether his spiritual life is meaningful. To perceive the individual behind the immensity of the tasks is one of the paramount tasks of party committees.

It was noted at the plenum that, unfortunately, some bureau members, elected aktiv members, and sectoral department leaders still believe that people's education is a province involving the activity of the party committee's ideology secretary and officials from the relevant departments alone. They all seem to have enough time for things like conferences and operational discussions. But frequently there is no time left for the main task of getting to know people better. But the party committee is primarily an organ of political leadership, with its inherent methods of ideological influence. The science of leading people is not an easy subject to learn. The oblast is suffering from an obvious shortage of competent and politically literate ideological workers who love working with people. More often than not they follow customs and await instructions from above. Little initiative is shown. This is why the effect of formalism, edification, and triteness can still be felt in educational work.

A party committee's work largely bears the stamp of its leader's personality. In one way or another, people acquire the manner, rhythm, and method of his actions. Party Obkom First Secretary B. Volodin made the following self-critical observation:

"So far I have been unsuccessful in fully concentrating the efforts of party, soviet, and economic organs on the implementation of decisions determining the dynamism and acceleration of the oblast's socioeconomic development. I still have not managed to achieve a radical restructuring in work with cadres. At times I am short on self-possession and patience. All this, of course, could not have failed to produce an effect on the results of the CPSU Obkom Bureau's work on the leadership of restructuring."

Those who spoke in the debate also criticized the first secretary. They suggested that he should organize the bureau's work more efficiently and aim more persistently at ensuring that it acts not as an economic but as a political organ and that, having cast off the burden of current trivialities, it concentrates more on the most important long-term problems.

...And so, there was criticism. Unbiased, comradely. What is to be done now? Take it into consideration, draw conclusions. And act. Everyone must work harder.

Medvedev Gives Speech to GOSR Conference

PM101235 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "The Great October Revolution and the Modern World"]

[Text] The social, political, and spiritual potential of the Great October Revolution continues to have an enormous influence on world development. This was stressed at the international scientific conference "The Great October Revolution and the Modern World" which began work on 8 December in Moscow.

The conference, in which scientists and social figures from almost 70 countries are taking part, was opened by G.L. Smirnov, director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

A report was given by V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Today, at this crucial stage in human civilization, he said, we are fully aware of the historic importance of everything that happened in Russia in October 1917. Just as the 19th century was influenced by the great French Revolution, so the most important sociopolitical processes in our century bear the indelible stamp of the Great October Revolution's influence.

The world and all its component parts, its material foundation and its political and spiritual aspect, have undergone radical change in the last 70 years. The novelty of contemporary processes introduces the need for serious amendments to our theory. Without losing the thread of Marxist continuity, we are faced with the task of answering vital questions, fully regenerating the Leninist concept of socialism, and ensuring the qualitative growth and creative development of our theoretical legacy.

The 70th anniversary of the October Revolution celebrations and the meeting of representatives of parties and movements are major landmarks in the solution of this task. The October celebrations brought our party to new frontiers in its interpretation of the ground covered and achievements made to date and in its understanding of the problems still to be resolved. A new boost was given to restructuring, international activity, and development of theoretical ideas.

This primarily applies to our understanding of the nature of the time in which we live, the speaker noted. Immediately after the October Revolution, under the influence of its victory and the revolutionary upsurge in the West, notions of the rapid development of the revolutionary process on a world scale predominated in our political and theoretical thinking. The concept of the New Economic Policy advanced by V.I. Lenin carried the Leninist "idea of peaceful coexistence ('peaceful cohabitation [sozhitelstvo]')," as M.S. Gorbachev noted, "from the initially purely political sphere, even the diplomatic sphere, into the sphere of the fundamental laws of the era."

The narrow class view taken prevented the ruling circles in the West from grasping the prospects inherent in the idea of peaceful coexistence. They made a different choice, namely, military interference, economic blockade, and political pressure. Under these conditions, the Soviet Union was forced to fall back on its own resources in virtually everything. This fed the spirit of autarky and led to a closed society and a guarded attitude toward the rest of the world.

At the end of the fifties, under the influence of the 20th Congress directives, peaceful coexistence between the two systems began to be regarded as an independent phase of historical development, during which economic competition between the two systems would develop. But even this approach was linked with hopes of gaining the upper hand over capitalism in economic competition in the space of some 10-20 years, which proved impracticable.

Dwelling on the development of ideas on capitalism in this connection, the speaker noted that for a long time our social science and, to a certain extent, our political practice were based on outmoded concepts and that a number of vital issues remained outside scientific analysis, such as capitalism's ability to rise to new levels of production socialization and extend the limits of productive forces' development. Now, when monopolist capitalism is nearing its 100th birthday, the notion that it is a modification of "classical" 19th century capitalism is increasingly at variance with reality. The question arises: Is not the era of free competition the forerunner of monopolist capitalism, as the capitalist mode of production which more fully reflects its essence?

It does not follow, of course, that due to capitalism's ability to adapt to new conditions, the antagonistic nature of this system has changed. In addition to the "classical" contradiction between labor and capital, unemployment, absence of social guarantees, and cyclical nature of development, more and more new contradictions are appearing. Militarism, the neocolonialist system, and the disintegration of culture and morals are enormously destructive.

It is now clear, the speaker noted, that the logical succession of socioeconomic formations will continue over a longer period of time than previously thought and with a considerable diversity of transitional forms. Hence stems the prospect of protracted coexistence and collaboration between the two social systems.

Our understanding of the nature and forms of coexistence also has to be updated. The notion of the systems moving in parallel is an illusion. The interdependence of the world is such that these parallel lines will inevitably intersect and both systems and the countries belonging to them will closely collaborate in the context of general world development, in the scientific and technical, economic, and social spheres, in human relations, and in the solution of global problems. Strictly speaking, this process is already upon us. We are faced with the task of defining the forms of collaboration whereby socialism would play an even more active part in the processes of world development and the international division of labor, while preserving its predominant socialist nature and increasing its influence.

The new political thinking developed by the CPSU incorporates Leninist ideas and takes into account the world's growing interdependence, the realities of the nuclear era, and the scientific and technical revolution. It proceeds from the supremacy of common human values and offers an answer to the most serious current issues, primarily mankind's survival.

In the spirit of the new political thinking, we are also clarifying our ideas on the pace and nature of social progress, the paths it will take, and its motive forces. In general terms, we can say that it is a process involving the renewal of socialism and its ascent to a new qualitative state; the struggle of the working class and the broad working masses within the capitalist system itself; the solution of the most serious problems in developing countries by thoroughly restructuring the world political and economic order; and the solution of global, general human problems, primarily removal of the threat of nuclear war and creation of a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

The kind of future mankind can expect depends to an enormous extent on the prospects of socialism's development and renewal and its attainment of a new qualitative state. The present period is particularly important in the history of socialism. Giving a detailed description of theoretical and practical work to restructure and

renew Soviet society, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed that the country has reached a crucial stage, namely the materialization of restructuring and the translation of its ideas and plans into practice. Work is proceeding in two main directions: extensive democratization of society and radical economic reform. Life demands that we go faster. The people want quick, decisive action. If we lose time, we may find ourselves in a difficult situation. But we cannot fail to see something else: Restructuring affects the lives of millions of people. That is why ill-prepared, emotional actions can only harm matters. Every step must be carefully weighed and considered in the context of the radical, strategic objectives.

A search for ways to renew society and far-reaching reforms designed to bring socialism to a new qualitative level of development are also in progress in a number of other socialist countries. This fact in itself is evidence that world socialism is entering a new stage of development and moving away from one historical model to another, which is in line with current conditions.

World socialism is also entering a new stage from the viewpoint of the restructuring of relations between socialist countries. The Moscow meeting of CEMA leaders in November 1986 had decisive significance with regard to coordinating and consolidating this common approach. V.A. Medvedev described the major positive changes in all-around cooperation between socialist countries and underlined the need for a thorough theoretical grasp of world socialism as a social phenomenon, forms in which it develops, and concepts in which it is described. Dwelling on the development of ideas on such an important question, in the political and theoretical respect, as the correlation of the basic general laws and national features of socialist development, he stressed that socialism's strength, confirmation of its universality, and enrichment of socialist ideas lie in the acknowledgement, consideration, and use of this multitude of forms and national manifestations. It is important, of course, to ensure that national features do not become absolutes in this respect.

The speaker drew attention to questions of economic relations between socialist states. Here virtually a sea of problems exists whose theoretical study is of paramount importance to practice. We have to solve a number of major questions relating to formation of a unified socialist market, cut the knot of currency and financial problems, make the problem of price formation a matter of mutual concern, open the way to contractual prices, and more boldly prepare the ground for a transition to mutually convertible currency.

In recent decades, the speaker noted, the concept of "global problems" has earned its credentials and become firmly established in world politics. The most important and most urgent of these problems is preserving peace and preventing a nuclear cataclysm. If mankind resolves this problem, it will have a good chance of solving other problems and creating a qualitatively different world. In this sense, the current Soviet-American summit meeting has truly historic significance. For the first time in the 40 years of the nuclear age, an agreement is being reached to not simply limit nuclear arsenals but actually reduce them. The first breach is opening in the once seemingly insuperable wall of nuclear confrontation. The clock of history will begin to measure a new time: movement toward a nuclear-free world.

The problem of developing countries released from colonial dependence is another cornerstone in the building of a new world. The October Revolution has also had an influence in this direction. The ideas it advanced—nations' right to self-determination, the need to end imperialist plunder and build exchange between developed and developing countries on a fair basis—retain their unfading importance today. The young Soviet state demonstrated in practice how equitable relations must be built with once oppressed peoples, wiped out the legacy of the past, and gave these peoples disinterested assistance.

The speaker noted that the breach between the developed capitalist North and the developing South is growing. He noted that the situation is fraught with the danger of an explosion, the consequences of which are hard to predict in today's interconnected world. We are fully on the side of peoples' struggling for their national liberation and independent economic development, and we give them every assistance possible. At the same time, we favor seeking global solutions to the common problems of this region of the world.

In conclusion, V.A. Medvedev touched on the issues of collaboration between progressive, peace-loving forces. The working class, he stressed, is still the main force of social progress. At the same time, the scale, volume, and, most important, the worldwide nature of contemporary progress predetermine a considerable increase in forces that can and must play a part in solving urgent historical tasks.

In this respect, he emphasized the unique importance of the meeting of representatives of parties and movements held in Moscow during the October Revolution celebrations, which, despite the difference of views and opinions of its participants, confirmed their common desire for peace and the need for joint action to preserve peace. Conditions are now being created for gradually building dialogue between communists and social democrats while ensuring that each of these political trends retain their independence and originality. A new style and a new level of relations based on mutual respect, comparison of views, and rejection of know-it-all arrogance are important for the establishment of real collaboration.

Dwelling on the question of the development of the communist movement, the speaker noted that difficulties have arisen on this path as a result of previous violations of the principles of interparty relations. This is

all in the past now. In our opinion, nothing should prevent communists from exchanging experience and cooperating more closely. As an inseparable part of the international communist movement, the CPSU understands its role and place in today's rapidly changing world. Our search coincides with that of other fraternal parties.

Mankind has reached a crucial stage. Whether it will be able to come through this crucial phase in history largely depends on the joint actions of all left-wing, peace-loving forces. We are convinced, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee concluded, that an enormous role is to be played by socialism and its ability to fully reveal its potential and reach new frontiers. Soviet Communists regard achievement of these goals as loyalty to the October traditions and their duty to future generations.

On the same day, the conference participants began discussing, in three sections, a broad range of problems concerning world development, real socialism, and the struggle for peace and new political thinking.

Theatrical Play on Chernobyl Banned in Moscow

LD101046 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0519 GMT 10 Dec 87

[by Aleksandar Novacic]

[Text] Moscow, December 10 (TANJUG)—While theatre companies in Vienna, London, Budapest, Stockholm, Oslo, Tokyo, Los Angeles, Hamburg and a dozen Soviet cities have "The Sarcophagus" on their repertoires, the play which deals with the Chernobyl nuclear accident has been banned in Moscow.

Muscovites had the chance of seeing Vladimir Gubaryov's play only recently when a theatre company from Tambov gave a guest performance in the Soviet capital. Despite the ban, this provincial theatre gave all four scheduled performances, and each time to a full house.

Gubaryov himself sees no "politics" in the ban on performing "The Sarcophagus" in Moscow. Naturally, there were many who were struck by the text's severity and mercilessness towards those responsible for the Chernobyl tragedy, but no political objections were made. Gubaryov believes it is simply a matter of jealously, as it has been a long-standing belief that "everything that is the best originates from Moscow". This time, however, the provincial theatres got ahead of those from Moscow. The author of "The Sarcophagus" maintains that this was the reason for the play to be banned in Moscow by—people from the theatre.

To put it more precisely, the play was banned by someone (he declines to say who exactly) from the union of theatrical workers which has taken on some of the competencies of the Ministry of Culture since the ministry is, as part of a streamlining process, decreasing the number of its workers. Clerks in the union are more dangerous than clerks in the ministry, Gubaryov states, adding that the most dangerous of all bureaucrats is the "creative bureaucrat".

Gubaryov does not conceal his bitterness over the fact that the play is not yet on the repertoire of Moscow's theatres.

He draws attention to yet another fact: withdrawal from the U.S.-Soviet film coproduction. U.S. film director Stanley Kramer came to the Soviet Union to offer a joint production of the film. The union of film workers of the Soviet Union, Gubaryov claims, was not interested in a joint deal with the Americans and simply let them have the film story on Chernobyl.

Solovyev Sees 'No Alternative' to Restructuring

PM091615 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 87 p 1

[LENTASS report under the rubric "Your Contribution, Party Committee": "Reinforcing Restructuring With Concrete Actions"]

[Excerpts] The reports being given in primary party organizations by party committees and party bureaus on the work to lead restructuring are an important stage in the Leningrad Communists' preparation for the 19th all-union party conference. The fruitfulness of party influence on all aspects of labor collectives' lives is being assessed from positions of high exactingness. It is these criteria which were made the basis of an analysis of the party committee's work at a party meeting at one of the city's science-and-production associations. [not further identified; no date supplied] [passage omitted]

Yu.F. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Leningrad party obkom, addressed the meeting.

The party meetings—being held in accordance with the CPSU Central Committee guidelines—at which their executive organs are reporting on the leadership of restructuring, he said, are intended to make a deep and thorough analysis of the results of this work in every labor collective and to outline specific measures to lend new impetus to acceleration.

Special significance is being lent to the important political campaign that has been mounted by the nature and tremendous responsibility of the present moment, when the initial first stage—the stage of elaborating the party's new course—has been completed in the main. The practical realization of the outlined program is now the most important matter.

In this extremely complex period there are a number of large-scale interconnected problems, embracing the economy, the social and spiritual sphere, and the development of democratization and glasnost, which need

tackling at the same time. Party organizations are required today as never before to display strong political will, iron discipline, initiative, and the skill to mobilize working people toward achieving the set goals and to direct into a single channel the energetic action of trade union and Komsomol organizations and soviet and economic organs.

The idea that it is inadmissible to lag behind dynamic social processes could be heard with special trenchancy at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum and in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech at the recent meeting with the Leningrad party organization aktiv. It was stressed that the party should grow in all its links and all its echelons, expand in its work at all levels, and approach its 19th party conference fully armed with new experience of implementing revolutionary transformations of society.

The Leningrad party organization and the city and oblast's working people are entering the finishing straight of the second year of the 5-year period with good results on the whole. The rate of economic growth has increased, and positive changes are taking place in the social sphere.

The life of labor collectives and of all Leningraders is being filled with new content and is becoming more closely bound up with the prospects for the region's socioeconomic development.

Recently the CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined and approved the General Plan for the Development of Leningrad and Oblast for the Period Through 2005. It opens up fundamentally new opportunities for combining all spheres of the population's activity more harmoniously and accelerating the resolution of problems affecting Leningraders' vital interests.

Here the visible token of the innovation brought by restructuring, which is the direct continuer of the cause of the revolution and the traditions of October, can also be seen.

The progress and significance of restructuring in the development of society and the role of party organizations in tackling the tasks advanced were analyzed in a principled and profound party manner in the report at the celebration session in Moscow to mark the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The fundamental conclusion is that, whatever difficulties we come across and whatever obstacles stand in our path, the processes of renewal and transformation in our country are irreversible.

There is no alternative to restructuring. Anyone who fails to understand this and who continues to take up a temporizing, unconstructive, and passive position and permits words to diverge from deeds is inevitably on the sidelines of acceleration. Today each party organization's place is in the thick of the concerns of restructuring.

Indeed a start has been made, Yu.F. Solovyev noted further, and this is apparent from your association's example. A struggle has been mounted against negative manifestations and violators of labor discipline. There is more organization and order in production. There is clear evidence—and this is most important—of people being disposed toward highly efficient and intensive labor and new approaches to tackling the tasks of accelerating scientific and technical progress.

At the same time, as already noted in the report and communists' speeches, the associations collective's degree of readiness to grasp the large-scale changes outlined by the party—a new antiwaste management mechanism and the carrying out of an active social policy—still fails to meet contemporary demands fully.

The causes are varied. On the one hand, a number of leaders of science and production subdivisions find it difficult to give up accustomed but long outmoded work forms and methods and have failed to renounce the pull of conference fever and red tape. On the other hand, some leaders still operate with one eye "upward," constantly awaiting recommendations and instructions from above.

In this situation by no means all the association's shop party organizations have been able to really give a lead to the work of restructuring. Some of them have failed to overcome inertia and indifference, and there is a lack of purpose aiming for an end result.

Take, for example, the implementation of the production intensification program. In the current year only 6 out of the 15 industrial robots and only 2 out of 6 machine tools with digital program control planned for introduction have so far been introduced. Neither a flexible automated line for 3 flexible production modules have been introduced, and only 1 of 10 resource-saving and waste-free technological processes are in use.

During the course of 1986/87, the party committee examined the progress being made in retooling the enterprise five times. The successes, shortcomings, and deficiencies in work were noted. And, finally, at the next bureau session, the management's proposal is being adopted on reducing the number of measures included in the production intensification program, since the necessary depth of study was not ensured at the formation stage.

What does this fact tell us? Obviously it tells us that even the party committee was lacking in competence, soundness, and depth in analyzing the expediency and effectiveness of the outlined measures.

This, to put it bluntly, superficial approach was also reflected in the results of the work to switch production to a multishift system. Compared with last year the proportion of those working on the second shift has only increased by 1%, reaching just over 17%, and the metal-working equipment shift index is barely in excess of 1.

As the party stresses, at the new stage of our society's development, we need both new economic thinking and **a new standard of party work in the economic sphere.** [words in boldface as published]. It is necessary to learn to direct economic leaders and labor collectives primarily toward the achievement of high product quality, the rapid renewal of equipment, the acceleration of financial resources turnover, and the improvement of capital returns—in brief, toward the end national economic result and not toward "gross output."

It is known, Yu.F. Solovyev continued, that the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) comes into force at the beginning of next year. It radically changes the economic and legal status of the basic link of the national economy. The enterprise is invested with greater rights and independence, which must be used with maximum benefit and effectiveness.

Is your collective ready for this?

Will it be able to painlessly overcome the organizational and psychological barriers, and does it fully appreciate what a serious responsibility is being laid on its shoulders? All these questions are by no means rhetorical. They require a precise answer, considered evaluation, and constructive solutions.

Today the radical reform of the management mechanism has been mentioned more than once. Next year a large group of Leningrad enterprises will switch to the new working conditions. And, to put it bluntly, the level of readiness of certain collectives for this switch inspires definite misgivings. In this respect you still have a year in reserve: You can act without fever and haste, checking every step.

However, nor must you under any circumstances delay or let things drift, you must not allow today's omissions in economic activity to make the enterprise's financial position more complicated in the future.

The association is faced with important problems in the sphere of improving product quality and bringing it up to the level of the best world models. Less than half of your enterprise's products are in the highest quality category, whereas the average figure for Leningrad is 54%. The items you produce have no counterparts in the country. In these conditions the party and professional conscience of every scientist, specialist, worker, and the entire collective must be the chief guarantee of their quality and high technical standard.

These and other questions must be constantly in the party committee's sphere of influence. It must call communist-leaders strictly to account for the real restructuring of economic activity and for the state of affairs in this or that important sector. And not only call to account, but also take party backup measures to ensure the realization of the set tasks and be the active transmitter of advanced experience.

You have considerable reserves for this. The switch to the new management conditions is linked not only with a new standard and methods of management, but also with the assertion in all labor collectives of economic accountability [khozraschet] as the basic principle for organizing matters.

It is clear that teams have a special role in improving the material interest of every worker in the end results of the common work. We must revive in practice everywhere the forgotten, very important principle of socialism—which in some places has been replaced by leveling: "to each according to his labor"—making full use to this end of the force of glasnost and democracy.

We must also constantly remember the fruitlessness of tackling economic problems in isolation from social problems. One of the main lessons of the past is precisely that being oblivious to this apparently simple truth leads to a vicious impasse.

A certain shift toward working people's needs and requirements has taken shape in your association. If we take the relative figures compared with the preceding period, they can even make us pleased: There is an almost 25% growth in the volume of sales of paid services and an increase in the list of services available and in the numbers being served. But, if we turn to absolute figures, it turns out that only an insignificant number of your thousands-strong collective can be using them.

We hear economic leaders' complaints about the lack of the necessary funds to expand the output of consumer goods and organize paid services. But, comrades, the shortages nearly always arise through lack of interest, enterprise, and initiative.

The most important thing now is not just to avoiding slackening but to increase to the utmost the efforts in these directions. It is a question of constructing housing, including construction by the own-resources method, providing workers with canteen places, fully meeting their need for personal plots, and accelerating the remodeling of pioneer camps. The timing of all this has been unjustifiably put off till the end of the 5-year period.

And another point. Everything in which the party committee is engaged and which it is tackling must be interpreted through an effective cadre policy. Through

the selection and placement of cadres and the timely promotion of energetic and enterprising people, who really support people in their affairs.

Here you have areas in which to improve. At many enterprises and scientific research organizations today, the leading staffs are formed in an atmosphere of glasnost and democracy. Such practice fully proves itself and makes it possible to objectively assess the work and moral qualities of each specific person. Nonetheless, the association is in no hurry to make use of this experience and is treating it with evident caution. There are—and indeed probably cannot be—any ready-made recipes as to how to act in each specific case.

And this applies fully to the reserve for promotion. Because this it is very necessary for the party committee and Communists to have the situation well in control, to know the mood in the collective, and to be able to forestall undesirable developments. In brief, on these questions the vanguard role of party organizations is not only not diminishing, but is even growing considerably. It is the party organization which must lead restructuring in the collective. And each Communist in the specific workplace.

The range of problems which require the close attention of the party committee is wide and varied. They include the intensification of party leadership of social organizations, primarily the trade union and the Komsomol organizations. (Suffice it to mention that in the last 2 years the work of the Communists in these organizations has been subjected to exacting analysis more than once.) They also include the development of socialist competition in conditions of glasnost and new management methods, and the organization of universal economic education.

Restructuring makes special claims on party members in everything. Yu.F. Solovyev said in conclusion, and they are indeed specially accountable. It must not be forgotten that the party has been given a mandate of trust by the people, but it is not an unlimited mandate. It must be justified by concrete, practical actions, seeking to ensure primarily that each person feels for himself the practical results of restructuring.

It is very important that the CPSU raykom gives the association's party committee and party organization more substantial and effective help in implementing these tasks. Experience shows that it is precisely in the "rayon committee-primary party organization" link that there is frequently a gap which prevents party directive being transferred rapidly into the channel of concrete deeds. Consequently, it must be determined on the spot how to ensure the stability and indissolubility of this link and how to direct it toward a qualitatively new standard of party work.

Your association is coping successfully with the targets of the 5-year plan on the whole. And while today we have been talking mainly about acute questions and shortcomings, it is only because now as never before it is necessary to see them more distinctly and to seek more persistently ways to further accelerate our onward progress.

Listeners' Opinions on Restructuring

LD091815 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Esteemed radio listeners. All-union radio's "Latest News" office and "Mayak" channel invite you to share your thoughts, observations, and suggestions regarding the changes underway in the country. We would like you to answer the questions in the following restructuring questionnaire:

How is restructuring affecting things in your labor collective? What does it mean in your life?

second question: What do you think should be done to ensure the success of restructuring?

third: What is preventing you from being completely in charge at your enterprise, kolkhoz or sovkhoz, establishment, or organization?

fourth: What do you think are the components of the braking mechanism? Please mention specific examples of this mechanism at work.

fifth: What do you find attractive or unattractive in full financial autonomy?

And the sixth question: What form do you think the vanguard role of communists should now take?

Your replies, comrades, will help in finding the most effective solutions for the further democratization of our society and for carrying through the radical economic reform. The most interesting suggestions and warning signals will be used in radio broadcasts involving specialists from various fields and leaders of all ranks. Please send your letters to "Restructuring Questionnaire, Mayak Radio, Moscow."

Historian Cited on Trotskiy Reappraisal

PM091646 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 5 Dec 87 p 10

[Interview with Yuriy Afanasyev, "rector of Moscow State Historical Archives Institute, by Vladimiro Odinzov in Palermo; date not given]

[Text] Who was Trotskiy and what is his place in the "blank pages" of Soviet history that Gorbachev has pledged to eliminate?

What is the real significance of the rehabilitation of a Bukharin within the context of the delicate and difficult task of reappraising the ground covered by the CPSU during its 70-year history? We put these questions to Yuriy Afanasyev, rector of Moscow State Historical Archievs Institute, who is taking part in the international conference in Palermo on "The October Revolution 70 Years Later" organized by the Cesme [expansion unknown].

"With regard to Bukharin," Afanasyev said, "this is simply another step toward the establishment of the truth about all those who were at one time unjustly persecuted. Gorbachev's 2 November speech, the five pages devoted by OGONEK to this issue when it published Anna Larina's letter—though I must say that Bukharin's wife had previously approached the Central Committee several times seeking a reappraisal of her husband's political trial—and, last, the publication of Bukharin's will in letter form by MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI are external manifestations of a process of reinterpretation of our history.

The documents being published now merely attest to his devotion to the cause of socialism and his profound faith in Leninism and in the revolution, of which he was a convinced supporter. The real problem, however, is how to tackle all the human and political aspects of a rehabilitation process.

If we look solely at the absurd charges leveled at Bukharin, many of Lenin's supporters, and basically Lenin's entire guard, their inconsistency is obvious. There is no doubt, however, that their absurdity and falsity must be established legally and officially. There never was a criminal Bukharin, and you do not need to be a historian to realize this, but an official action is still needed to eliminate that charge.

What is much more important, however, is a rehabilitation in terms of the restoration of the historical truth, of the correct placing of Bukharin's role in the revolution and in socialist building at a particular moment in our history.

Even once he has been absolved of the charges, there will still remain Stalin's lie about Bukharin, who in text books and publications is still an enemy of the people, a traitor, and an opponent of socialism, and only when Stalin's falsifications have been eliminated can Bukharin be rehabilitated from not only the criminal but also the political and social viewpoint.

[Odinzov] Does this apply to Trotskiy as well?

[Afanasyev] Of course, he is by no means an exception. This person must be examined with a scholar's eyes, emotions must be set aside, and he must be assessed critically and within a very broad historical outlook; only then will the full paradox of this figure emerge. Trotskiy did not remain unchanged; he changed continually and behaved unjustly toward Lenin, with blameworthy and deplorable actions.

However, there were moments in history when Trotskiy played an extremely positive role, by Lenin's own admission. It is certainly no coincidence that Lenin described him in his will as the best member of the party. There is another matter, however.

When people in our country people talk and write about Trotskiy as the major enemy of the revolution and socialism and deny him any credit for the success of the civil war, they unintentionally put Lenin in a very ambiguous position. Indeed either Lenin was so naive as to fail to recognize Trotskiy for what he really was and was the prisoner of his advice or—worse still—Lenin was an unscrupulous politicker prepared to exploit whoever could serve his political ends. In either case Lenin would emerge very badly.

Trotskiy must therefore be studied very carefully because, like it or not, he was in any case a party member and to separate him so sharply from the CPSU would mean ignoring all the great Bolshevik forces that were behind Trotskiy and that belonged to the party. Together with all the others, Trotskiy must not remain an exception but must become the subject of an objective and dispassionate historical analysis that must not be kept secret.

[Odinzov] How do you explain this interest for the first time in the Soviet press in someone such as Bukharin, whom Stalin consigned to oblivion?

[Afanasyev] It is not the first instance. Apart from Bukharin, people have already written about Raskolnikov, Zinovyev, and Kamenev, portraying these analyses as a reflection of the "new climate." Actually, they were a manipulation of historical facts, adapted to present conditions—the same lies as before or, if you prefer, half-truths worse than the lies.

[Odinzov] It is said in Moscow that restructuring has settled down, lost its initial impetus and enthusiasm.

[Afanasyev] Perhaps, but restructuring, viewed correctly in the long term, is composed of ebbs and flows. The Yeltsin case is an example of this.

The former Moscow party secretary himself built the conditions for his case to end as it did precisely because he failed to plan his efforts in the long term. At earlier meetings, those dismissed from their posts had already started wondering whether the time had not come to seek revenge. However, if you analyze the proceedings of the Moscow Gorkom Plenum, you have the clear impression that those who spoke there are certainly not the best

representatives of the Moscow party organization and in their speeches they certainly did not make a good impression from the moral viewpoint.

[Odinzov] Nobody defended him on that occasion, however.

[Afanasyev] That is not true. There were subtle differences between the charges leveled, but I perceive a political archaism in the apparent monolithism and in the gorkom proceedings. The unanimity of the speeches made a negative impression on me. I would have behaved differently. There is no doubt that Yeltsin was guilty of faults and errors, but he always acted in line with the 27th CPSU Congress guidelines.

The good things he did should also have been pointed out and a more thorough assessment made of why not only he but the entire Moscow party organization failed in certain things. Yeltsin's self-accusation surprised me by the kind of repentance and reappraisal that came about within the space of just a few days.

Komsomol Plenum Views Progress, Expels Miscreants

PM101111 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 p 1

["Information Report on the Second All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Plenum"—KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The Second All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Plenum was held in Moscow on 7 December. It considered the following questions:

1. On the restructuring process in the Komsomol and development of Komsomol organizations' initiative in tackling the socioeconomic tasks facing the country in conditions of radical economic reform.

2. Information on the process of implementing critical observations and proposals made at the 20th Komsomol Congress.

3. On the organization of the work of Komsomol Central Committee members and candidate members.

4. On Komsomol Central Committee instructions.

5. Organizational matters.

Komsomol Central Committee First Secretary V. Mironenko delivered the report on the first item.

Contributions were made to the discussion of the report by: S. Romanov, lathe operator at the "Leningradskiy Metallicheskiy Zavod" turbine construction production association; V. Tsybukh, first secretary of the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee; Ye. Gordeyeva, first secretary of Ivanovo Komsomol Obkom; S. Voronin, director of the Yu.A. Gagarin sovkhoz in Zhanadalinskiy Rayon, Turgay Oblast, Kazakh SSR; N. Razvorotnev, first secretary of Lipetsk Komsomol Obkom; S. Alekrepov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Komsomol Central Committee; A. Selyanov, Komsomol committee secretary at the Moscow physical engineering institute; K. Zazirniy, first secretary of Krasnodar Komsomol Kraykom; G. Poleshchuk, group chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch "Katalizator" intersectoral scientific-technical complex; R. Abdukadyrov, fitter at the "Tashkentskiy Traktornyy Zavod Imeni 50-Letiya SSSR" production association; N. Yashkin, first secretary of Tyumen Komsomol Obkom; V. Galayda, first secretary of Kamchatka Komsomol Obkom; R. Safuanov, first secretary of Bashkir Komsomol Obkom; R. Alimov, first secretary of the Tajikistan Komsomol Central Committee; V. Vdovin, second mate of the Murmansk Shipping Line's nuclear-powered icebreaker "Rossiya"; V. Tretyakov, first secretary of Gomel Komsomol Obkom; S. Korenchikov, lathe operator at the Tula armory; D. Margvelidze, first secretary of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee; S. Grinevetskiy, first secretary of Odessa Komsomol Obkom; A. Trubin, steel worker at the Nizhniy Tagil V.I. Lenin metallurgical combine in Sverdlovsk Oblast; G. Marga, cast metal cleaner at the Riga "VEF" production association named for V.I. Lenin in the Latvian SSR; V. Polyakov, first secretary of Orel Komsomol Obkom; I.I. Mazur, USSR deputy minister for the construction of petroleum and gas industry enterprises; S. Tsyplyayev, academic secretary at the Leningrad S.I. Vavilov state optical institute; N. Sharov, second secretary of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee; Ye. Korolev, senior engineer at the Sverdlovsk "Avtomatika" science-production association, and S. Dyakin, first secretary of Ekibastuz Kazakhstan Komsomol Gorkom, Pavlodar Oblast.

The Komsomol Central Committee plenum noted that the period since the 20th Komsomol Congress has been characterized by and large by an improvement in the atmosphere in many Komsomol organizations, an increase in their contribution to solving economic and social tasks, and a quest for new approaches in work with young people. The first real steps have been taken to widen the independent initiative of primary organizations and establish an atmosphere of democracy and glasnost in them. At the same time, the failure of many Komsomol committees and Komsomol workers to grasp the idea of restructuring in the Komsomol adopted at the 20th congress is still a factor. There has been a reluctance to use the right to independently choose forms and methods of tackling the tasks, people are still advocating directive methods in leadership, and there is still a lack of assertiveness and persistence in educational and organizational work and in the protection of young people's rights.

A plenum resolution makes it incumbent on Komsomol committees to enhance young people's role in accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, developing initiative and activeness, and ensuring backing for

socially significant young people's initiatives. While establishing democratic principles in the selection and placement of Komsomol cadres, it is necessary to train them for work in new conditions, teach them to solve practical tasks, consult with young people, carry out a fundamental appraisal of the situation, and resolutely rebuff instances of conservatism and other negative phenomena in the youth sphere.

The plenum listened to information on the process of implementing critical observations and suggestions made at the 20th congress. Komsomol Central Committee Secretary V. Denisov made an announcement on the matter.

Komsomol Central Committee Secretary N. Dolgushkin made an announcement on the question of organizing the work of Komsomol Central Committee members and candidate members. The plenum approved a statute on formations made up of members and candidate members of the Komsomol Central Committee and the membership and chairmen of Komsomol Central Committee commissions.

The plenum also discussed and approved the Komsomol Central Committee instructions "On the registration of Komsomol members and issue of Komsomol documents, "On work with documents in Komsomol okruzhkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms," and "On work with documents in primary Komsomol organizations."

The plenum considered some organizational matters.

The Komsomol Central Committee plenum acceded to D. Ostroushko's request to be relieved of his membership of the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau in view of his taking up a lengthy assignment abroad.

The plenum elected V. Zyukin, chief of the Komsomol Central Committee Komsomol Organs Department, member of the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau.

The plenum acceded to the requests of Z. Dragunkina and S. Lapshin to leave the Komsomol Central Committee because they are changing their places of work.

The plenum removed A. Mikheykin and A. Oleynikov from the Komsomol Central Committee for bringing themselves into disrepute.

The plenum gave Komsomol Central Committee membership to Ye. Korolev, senior engineer at the Sverdlovsk "Avtomatika" science-production association, and A. Zavarzin, commander of an all-union student detachment.

The plenum gave Komsomol Central Committee candidate membership to S. Lyamin, chief of the Komsomol Central Committee Working Youth Department.

The following took part in the plenum's work: A.G. Melnikov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Construction Department; N.A. Zolotarev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organization Work Department; V.G. Volchikhin, sector chief in the CPSU Central Committee Party Organization Work Department; V.S. Kudinov, lecturers' group leader at the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department; A.A. Babenko, USSR minister of construction in eastern regions; V.G. Klyuyev, USSR minister of light industry; N.T. Arkhipets, deputy chairman of the USSR Gossnab; senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, ministries, and departments, first secretaries of union republic Komsomol Central Committees and Komsomol kraykoms and obkoms, assistant chiefs for Komsomol work in political directorates and political departments of military and border districts, fleets, and categories and groups of forces not already members of elected central Komsomol organs, representatives of the media, and secretaries of USSR embassies in contact with socialist countries' youth leagues.

Demichev Addresses Fergana, Ashkhabad Aktivs

PM081011 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "The Topical Tasks of Restructuring"]

[Text] P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, visited Uzbekistan and Turkmenia 26 November-3 December.

In Tashkent he took part in the work of the international conference "For a Nuclear-Free and Nonviolent World," devoted to the first anniversary of the Delhi Declaration.

P.N. Demichev visited Fergana Oblast in Uzbekistan and acquainted himself with the work of local soviets and the population's working and living conditions. A meeting with the oblast party and soviet aktiv was held in Fergana.

It was opened by Kh.U. Umarov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Obkom.

Addressing the meeting, P.N. Demichev stressed that the life of the party and the people at present is increasingly affected by the strategy elaborated by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th Party Congress. In his report at the ceremonial session in the Kremlin devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, drew a broad historical panorama of the achievements of the builders of the new society. At the same time, this picture can serve as a lesson of honesty and principledness needed to draw the correct conclusions from historical experience and to plot the routes of restructuring as accurately as possible. The party will continue purposefully and unswervingly to seek to implement the main aim of restructuring, which

consists of the full theoretical and practical restoration of Lenin's concept of socialism. This concept gives unquestionable priority to the working man with his ideals and interests and to humanistic values in the economy, social and political relations, and culture.

The coming year of 1988, the first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium said, must be regarded as decisive in the implementation of the main tasks of restructuring national economic management. Solving the complex and responsible tasks confronting us demands new approaches and hard work. We must remember that the success of our common cause depends today on the skill and persistence of each one of us.

My visits to Uzbek enterprises and organizations have convinced me that leaders and working people alike have correctly understood the tasks of restructuring. At the same time, preparations for the switch to new conditions of management are still proceeding too slowly. At the Tashkent agricultural machinery plant, for instance, which is switching to full economic accountability [khozrashchet] and self-financing, people still have no idea what problems this may pose for the labor collective and how they should prepare right now to resolve these problems. Acting vigorously, without waiting for directives and instructions from the ministry is the task now. Everyone needs to learn to act in the spirit of socialist enterprise.

Describing the course toward implementing an active social policy on which the party has embarked, the speaker pointed out that it closely combines large-scale statewide programs with the provision of broad scope for enterprises' initiative and development of cooperatives and individual labor activity. The party regards the enhancement of the role of soviets in economic and social development as a realistic path toward solving the set tasks. The work of soviets as organs of self-administration, of the rule of the people by the people, needs profound restructuring. The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers 25 July 1986 resolution points in this direction. Discussing the work of Tajik SSR, Chelyabinsk Oblast, and Karakalpak ASSR soviets of people's deputies in implementing this resolution, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium noted serious shortcomings in their work. The work of many local soviets continues to bear the imprint of the burden of the past, and frequently they fail to play a leading role in the economic and social development of their territories.

Restructuring the soviets, the speaker continued, is closely connected with the enhancement of the standard of their work in economic and social planning. The plans they adopt must become an effective lever in developing regions and solving social questions.

Positive experience in this respect has been accumulated by organs of power in Belorussia, the Ukraine, and a number of other republics and oblasts.

However, modern approaches to planning and management are being mastered very slowly. Many soviets have still not grasped what returns an oblast, city, or rayon can obtain by pooling the forces and resources of enterprises and associations to resolve economic problems and by utilizing the entire potential of scientific and design establishments located on their territory. We regard establishment of main production-and-economic administrations at krayispolkoms and oblispolkoms as an important step on the road of enhancing their role in economic and social development. Naturally, much will depend here on the standard of the cadres of these administrations and the overall content of their work. But not only on them, of course. The entire body of deputies will have to start working in new fashion.

Sharing his impressions from a visit to Fergana Oblast's Namuna village soviet in Kuvinskiy Rayon and Tashlakskiy Rayispolkom, the speaker drew attention to the fact that soviets must seriously attend to the training of deputies and help them master their duties. They must also rid themselves of the mania for holding meetings. Many questions must be resolved promptly and on the spot. Then there will be less paperwork and more real results.

Constant, businesslike, and very close relations between organs of power and labor collectives must become the rule rather than the exception, the first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium said. All democratic forms of work—the submission of reports to labor collectives by ispolkoms, sections, and the deputies themselves, and visiting sessions of ispolkoms and standing commissions at plants, construction sites, and kolkhozes—must be geared to this aim.

The times demand that session work be improved. Consultation with the people must become an indispensible precondition of the adoption of socially significant decisions. Active efforts to raise problems which concern the masses and the ability to defend the interests of the population and to combat a narrow departmental approach enhance the prestige of the soviets' executive organs.

It is essential to ensure an influx of active, competent people into the soviets, people who are able in practice to tackle overdue issues and complex problems raised by restructuring, and this makes it necessary to give some serious thought to improving the election system.

This is the essence of the experiment carried out during the past elections to the local soviets in multiseat electoral okrugs.

Noting the complexity and truly historic scale of the tasks in renewing all aspects of life, P.N. Demichev emphasized that the potential of our society and the opportunities inherent in restructuring and in the energy and initiative of the Soviet people are also vast.

In their speeches A.G. Likholat, chairman of the Fergana Gorispolkom; A. Buriyev, chairman of the Uzbekistanskiy Rayispolkom; A.N. Mansurov, chief of the oblast health department; and G.D. Kotovrasov, first deputy chairman of the oblispolkom; analyzed the first experience of work in conditions of restructuring and the problems arising. The influence of soviets which are paying more attention to economic issues is growing. It was noted that considerable reserves to enhance economic efficiency do exist at enterprises. However, organs of power and deputies are not always fully exercising the rights which they have been granted and are sometimes too timid in their approach to enterprise leaders. More efforts are needed to develop the social sphere.

The question of the ecological situation in the oblast and provision of health care was raised sharply. In this context, criticism was leveled at central ministries and departments.

P.N. Demichev also visited the republic Academy of Sciences Institute of Bioorganic Chemistry, the R.R. Shreder horticulture and viticulture science-and-production association, the Tashkent machine building plant, and a number of trade and consumer service enterprises. He took part in the inauguration ceremony of the "Solntse" complex near Tashkent, designed to use solar energy for scientific and production ends.

The first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin monument in the center of Tashkent. Flowers were also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

During his stay in Uzbekistan, Comrade Demichev was accompanied by I.B. Usmankhodzhayev, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee; G.KH. Kadyrov, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers; and A.P. Romanovskiy, deputy chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium.

In the Turkmen SSR, he met with the republic party, soviet, and economic aktiv in Ashkhabad.

The meeting was opened by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee.

P.N. Demichev congratulated the republic's working people on successful fulfillment of the jubilee year state plan for the procurement of raw cotton.

It must be noted, he said, that this year workers of the Turkmen agro-industrial complex achieved better results than in the past, despite the fact that weather conditions this year were no more favorable than in past years. But let us not be complacent about our achievements. The republic has good prospects, but there are also serious problems, of course. They must be tackled in a businesslike fashion, in accordance with the spirit of the times. A great deal will depend on your own initiative and resourcefulness.

The speaker drew attention to the fact that the solution of a number of vital problems could be substantially assisted by exchanges of experience with other Soviet republics and regions of the country and by direct cooperation with them. Considerable reserves exist in the acceleration of construction. The potential inherent in combining science and production must also be fully brought into play. The Turkmen Academy of Sciences Deserts Institute is doing interesting work, for instance. Yet little is being done to apply the results of its research. The need to find optimum solutions to the region's water resources problems was emphasized in particular. Considerable benefit could be derived from pooling the efforts of scientific and production organizations of neighboring republics, which face similar tasks. In this context, it can be noted that in Uzbekistan considerable practical results have been achieved by the R.R. Shreder horticulture and viticulture association.

Dwelling on the rational utilization of water and land resources, the speaker especially mentioned the existence of fallow land in the vicinity of Ashkhabad. It should be allocated to citizens for garden and vegetable plots. Mountain slopes must also be utilized.

P.N. Demichev paid special attention to the human factor, which has been placed at the focus of restructuring. An important role here is played by a healthy moral and psychological climate in the labor collective and the family, he emphasized. This must not be neglected because it is here that considerable reserves for raising labor productivity and exploiting the creative potential of workers lie. Care for people's health must be one of the prime concerns. The republic needs new hospitals and health centers, of course, and the health care system in general must be improved. At the same time, mass sports and mass physical culture must be widely introduced in daily life.

The first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium went on to note that the most difficult and crucial stage of restructuring is now beginning. Its specificity lies in the fact, he said, that the economic strategy drawn up by the party must be adequately embodied in practice in the very grassroots of society's life, in labor collectives, at local level. As early as 1 January enterprises producing 60% of all output will switch to the principles of economic accountability and self-financing. This will affect the working and living conditions of millions of people. Practical implementation of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) means a kind of revolution in labor collectives' activities. The main task is to fully exploit the political, labor, scientific, and cultural potential of the people, bearing in mind the final aim: creating a mighty, constantly developing material foundation for our society's accelerated social and spiritual progress.

Economic

MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA Zaykov 27 Nov Report

PM091311 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 87 pp 1-3

[Unattributed report: "Strengthening the Economic Foundations of Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] The party organization and all labor collectives of the capital have launched detailed preparations for a crucial stage of the economy's restructuring—the transfer of the majority of associations, plants, and construction sites to operating in conditions of full economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] and self-financing—scheduled for the start of next year.

A city conference to examine enterprises' and organizations' degree of readiness for the introduction of the new economic mechanism and the entry into force of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) was held 27 November in Moscow.

Taking part in the conference's work were L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow party gorkom; L.A. Voronin, I.S. Silayev, and B.L. Tolstykh, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.G. Afonin, O.S. Belyakov, L.F. Bobykin, A.I. Volskiy, and I.P. Yastrebov, chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments; G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; senior CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers officials, USSR and RSFSR ministers, members of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau, and the leaders of the Moscow Gorispolkom

The conference was opened by an introductory speech by L.N. Zaykov.

Our society, he said, is entering the new stage of restructuring. As M.S. Gorbachev emphasizes, the chief content of this stage is the further democratization of all social life and the pursuit of a radical economic reform. The country has today undertaken work which is truly enormous in terms of its scale. Its content is determined by the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

If we are talking about the economy then these decisions direct the party and the entire people toward the further improvement of the economic mechanism. Within a short space of time we will have to have completed preparations for the transfer of industrial sectors to full economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] and self-financing.

At the same time the new year will see the full entry into force of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association). This is linked in its turn with the further development of self-management, the electivity of leaders, and the galvanization of the work of labor collective councils.

Thus we are talking about a deepening of the democratization processes, and in a most crucial sphere at that—the sphere of physical production.

At the new, exceptionally important stage of restructuring still greater significance is attached to the human factor and its creative potential, and the vanguard role of the party organizations and of each communist is enhanced.

Today we have to make a specific and profound examination of how the party's directives on the transfer to the new management conditions are being implemented in practice, directly within the labor collectives. Specific actions rather than general debate are needed now. It is above all the enterprise and sector leaders who are answerable for the organization and pursuit of this work. But special responsibility rests with the party organs. It is important for all elements of the city organization—from enterprise party groups and committees to party raykoms and gorkoms [as published]—to be brought into action.

The aim of our conference is to analyze the status of Moscow industry's preparation for the transfer to the new working conditions and to outline practical and urgent measures to eliminate all obstacles and shortcomings in the way of the introduction of efficient management methods. [passage omitted]

Summing up the results of the conference, L.N. Zaykov said:

I think that I will be expressing the opinion of you all by thanking the deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, the Central Committee department chiefs, and the ministers and leaders of central departments and organizations who have participated actively and in a businesslike way in the work of our conference. I am sure that this is just the beginning of amicable joint activity and firm collaboration between sector leaders and enterprises, labor collectives, and Moscow's party and soviet organs. This collaboration is useful for everyone, but it is most useful of all for our work and for the success of our cardinal economic restructuring.

There has been a businesslike, frank discussion of the key issues concerning the Moscow city party organization's activity to prepare enterprises for the transfer to full economic accountability [khozraschet] in the context of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise.

All the speakers unanimously supported the party course aimed at accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, democratizing social life, and implementing radical economic reform.

Specific proposals were made concerning improvement in the work forms and methods of party committees, soviet and economic organs, and social organizations that are aimed at enhancing labor collectives' activeness and their interest in intensifying production, expanding glasnost, and developing and deepening socialist democracy.

Constructive proposals were made to enhance the role of the human factor, strengthen discipline and order, and establish a healthy moral and psychological atmosphere in the city's party organization. The need was stressed to further enhance communists' militancy, their assertiveness and purposefulness, and their orientation toward real action.

At the same time, serious concern was expressed regarding the slow eradication of the negative phenomena which have accumulated and the poor use of scientific and technical achievements. Only one conclusion can be drawn: We must all greatly step up the pace of restructuring, to which there is no alternative.

At the conference held in the CPSU Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev stressed that the party's vanguard role lies in its ability to shape its work in line with vital requirements, take clear stock of the real historical situation, and perceive the new tasks.

Since the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum our ideas on the logical development of the socialist economy, production forces, and production relations have been considerably enriched. The CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum armed the party with principled, specific directives aimed at smashing the mechanism which is holding us back and oriented it toward the extensive introduction of truly economic methods of management. The party has already set about putting its plans into practice.

The process of forming a system of management for national economic complexes and groups of interconnected sectors is actively in progress. Measures have been taken to reduce superfluous administrative units and restructure the activity of ministries and central and economic departments.

As you know, decisions have recently been taken to accelerate the capital's socioeconomic development. They provide for further improvement in the living and working conditions of working people in this city of millions of inhabitants.

There is no doubt that the Moscow party organization has managed to impart a definite dynamism to economic processes in many spheres of the economy. Plans and socialist pledges for the current year are being successfully fulfilled. Industry in many rayons, including Gagarinskiy, Volgogradskiy, Oktyabrskiy, and a number of others, has ensured 100% fulfillment of contract commitments. But we must not flatter ourselves about our achievements. The pace of life dictated by restructuring requires us to work better today than yesterday. Hardly a single rayon coped with the targets for reducing prime cost. One in three of the city's enterprises has been fined for production shortfalls. The construction of housing and social, cultural, and consumer projects is under considerable strain.

We cannot tolerate such shortcomings. People expect tangible practical results from restructuring. Everything must be done everywhere to ensure fulfillment of the plans for this year, which is the decisive prerequisite for the stability of work under the new economic management conditions.

The alignment of the forms and methods of economic management with modern demands is most clearly reflected in the provisions of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association). This document must now become in the direct sense of the word a norm of life for each labor collective and a handbook for all party workers and economic leaders. Without knowledge of its provisions the processes taking place in our economy cannot be correctly directed, and it will be simply impossible to work with and in collectives.

We cannot permit any narrowing of the rights granted to enterprises, as has often happened in the past. As you know, the law contains an additional article "On Guarantees of the Observance of Enterprise Rights." It stresses that all organs of state power and administration are responsible for the strict observance of the law's provisions. This is of fundamental importance, and I would ask you to devo e particular attention to it.

The adoption of any amendments—including any instructions or other explanations and directives—that distort the essence of the law on the state socialist enterprise is impermissible. Practical measures are being taken in this respect. Thus, several hundred different restrictions and directives laid down by the USSR Gossnab have been lifted. But many leaders still have an administrative urge.

For instance, the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry has issued a whole volume of different amendments to existing provisions which can be used to veritably stifle the initiative of any collective.

Moreover, we have become accustomed to obsolete views of many problems. For instance, the Ministry of Railways pays literally minuscule fines for failing to meet freight delivery deadlines, while the enterprises that have not received the output on time suffer losses running into millions and are sometimes forced to deliver cargo by plane.

Comrades here have rightly said that economic organs need on the whole to look into the system of sanctions in the shape of fines. Their incorrect use under the conditions of the new economic mechanism could have a serious effect on enterprises' financial position.

The foundation of success now is to develop and encourage in every possible way the initiative of leaders and their socialist enterprise, and to actively involve the broad working people's masses in economic activity.

The Law on the State Enterprise grants extensive rights to labor collective councils. I want to stress that these are not simply consultative organs, but organs equipped with considerable rights under the law.

Stable long-term normatives are now becoming our main planning tools. They are all meant to link the size of enterprises' income and funds with the results of their activities, unite the interests of collectives with the interests of the state, and actively stimulate society's development. The first experience in applying the principles of full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing graphically shows how an extensive upsurge in the people's initiative is able to generate an expansion of the labor collectives' rights and independence in practice.

However, another obvious conclusion is also fair—mere enthusiasm for the implementation of the new economic management conditions is not enough. Some 160 industrial enterprises in the city have already switched to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing. Their share of total production is 34%. That is considerable. But the qualitative aspect is more important than the quantitative. That is the whole meaning of the work. But what is happening in practice?

So far the results of many of these enterprises have been worse than those of enterprises working in the old way. But this is linked not with economic accountability [khozraschet] but with the poor preparation for the transfer to the new working conditions. That is why we must seriously analyze the reasons behind disruptions and ensure that urgent measures are taken both by the enterprises themselves and by the central department. We must be unswervingly guided by the provision that what is good for labor collectives must be good for enterprises and society as a whole, and vice versa. In this regard I would like to draw attention to the fact that the shortcomings in the activity of enterprises that have switched to self-financing are not linked with the new system as such but are conditioned by poor preparations for their transfer to the new working conditions.

Full economic accountability [khozraschet] has pointed up more sharply the traditional shortcomings that had emerged previously in enterprises' work, and the failings in production management, planning, and organization. A great deal here, of course, depends on the ministries, but there are many questions which must be resolved by economic leaders and party committees at all levels.

In what do these consist? Today many speeches have noted in particular that there are still many leaders of enterprises, services, and shops who have a poor grasp of their specific activity under the new conditions. This is explained, as a rule, by the poor economic training of cadres.

The principles of full economic accountability [khozraschet] are not reaching the shops and sectors. Poor use is being made of effective labor remuneration and bonus payment systems. Yet the potential here is enormous.

One of the main directions of the economic reform under way is the strengthening of the interdependence of territorial and sectoral interests and the development of clear, joint, coordinated action.

Any enterprise—whatever sector it belongs to—must actively participate in resolving social and economic problems, rather than hide behind a "departmental fence." There is little of such mutual understanding as yet—hence many of our problems.

The radical restructuring of economic management must be indissolubly linked with enterprises' retooling. The state of affairs here needs serious improvement.

The party Central Committee has adopted an extensive program for modernizing industry, first and foremost machine building. It must be directly stated that this program is being implemented unsatisfactorily in Moscow's machine building complex.

Equipment renewal rates are poor. They are lower than the average for the country. Moreover, they are even tending to decline.

The creation of state-of-the-art equipment is inconceivable without the use of modern automated planning systems. Everyone now understands this. But can we seriously discuss this if the city's enterprises have neither information about the number of such systems or data about the effectiveness of their use? Ministries, and above all defense sectors, must draw specific conclusions from this.

Due attention is not being devoted to strengthening the experimental base of scientific research institutes and design bureaus. Clearly, it is no accident that the average gestation period for scientific and design developments over the last few years has not substantially diminished. Now, as you know, the output of scientific organizations is becoming a commodity [tovar]—a source for material incentives and the development of collectives. But if one bears in mind that the effectiveness of many scientific research institutes and design bureaus continues to remain poor, and certain of them do not even justify the

expenditure on their upkeep, how will the transfer of science to full economic accountability [khozraschet] be implemented? Measures need to be taken in this area immediately.

The enormous organizational, explanatory, and educational work done in the country during the introduction of state acceptance is well known. And it has borne fruit. Technological discipline has considerably strengthened under the influence of state acceptance, and production and labor organization have improved.

In the country as a whole some 1,500 enterprises are currently working under the new conditions of output acceptance. At the moment there are 59 such enterprises in Moscow, another 49 are preparing for the switchover, and in civilian machine building it is planned that state acceptance will cover all the most important itemized product lists as of the new year. However, the facts show that poor use is being made of the lessons of the transfer to state acceptance. Technical documentation is taking too long to review, the cadre selection process is sluggish, and work to improve manufacturing processes and strengthen the metrological base is being delayed. In some places the toughening of quality controls by state acceptance bodies and the sending back of output for further work are causing annoyance and dissatisfaction. There have even been cases of pressure being put on state acceptance organ workers not only by economic leaders but by party committees—something which has been discussed today too.

There is no doubt that the heightened demands on output quality have increased the manufacturing cycle for many articles, particularly at thoese enterprises where rush work prevails.

To be blunt, state acceptance has revealed and laid bare the technical faults, organizational shortcomings, irresponsibility, and indifferent attitudes to output quality that had become ingrained in many engineering and technical workers over the course of many years. In other words, it revealed negative factors in production activity which, as a rule, were overlooked not only by economic leaders but by party leaders too.

The overcoming of such negative phenomena is today an indicator of skillful work in the new way. This is attested by the experience of such front-ranking enterprises as the Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant, the Jig Boring Machine Tool Plant, and others.

They have experienced no fewer difficulties than others, but are distinguished by efficient labor organization, well-organized activity on the part of all services, constant concern for people, and high conscientiousness and discipline on the part of the working people. For such collectives neither state acceptance nor external reasons have been insuperable obstacles in the way of successfully fulfilling plan targets.

I draw your attention to the questions of enhancing in every possible way the quality of work and output for the further reason that, as of next year, state acceptance will be introduced into construction. There are far more shortcomings in this area than in industry. Construction work techniques are constantly violated. The quality of many elements of construction structures and materials cannot stand up to any criticism. Can we really hand over a finished project to state acceptance if it has been assembled from low-quality construction panels or modules? I recall that, when we embarked on the development of measures to improve the quality and reliability of machine building output, the first thing we did was to determine its actual technical standard. This made it possible to correctly select the most effective directions and priorities. This must be the starting point in construction too. This applies first and foremost to the construction materials industry, installation organizations, and, of course, the USSR Gosstroy, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and the USSR State Committee for Standards.

It is understandable, Comrades, that a new standard of technology and production organization is required in order to produce world-class machines and materials. The problem of urgently classifying the standard of articles and assessing the technical status of enterprises is now persistently on the agenda.

The State Committee for Science and Technology, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and sector ministries have been set the task of developing classifiers for output in order to determine the proportional and scientifically substantiated creation of, first and foremost, promising types of equipment: flexible modules, rotary conveyor belts, and processing centers.

These classifiers should be the basis for compiling a kind of technical and economic "passport" to development for each enterprise in the city. On the one hand, this will make it possible to determine the need for progressive types of equipment in the long run and, on the other, it will arm party, soviet, and economic organs with a clear idea of specific ways of ensuring the retooling of enterprises. An opportunity will emerge for conducting more meaningful work with cadres and for training the specialists we need. Party raykoms must take charge of the organization of this most important matter.

Moscow's economy occupies a leading place in the practical implementation of the outlined plans to accelerate our industry's progress to the forefront of science and technology. The city's enterprises produce almost 33% of the country's total output of machine tools with digital program control, one-fifth of all industrial robots, and over 12% of all automatic and semi-automatic machine tool line units. The city's mighty scientific and production potential can and must be used considerably better. The switching of Moscow's economy to the path of acceleration is of immense political and social importance. That is why we are right to put the question in

such a way as to ensure that it is here that the most advanced technology is introduced, that new-generation machines and equipment are developed, and that progressive structures and methods for running scientific and technical processes are drawn up—that is, everything that determines the basis for breakthroughs in all avenues of science and technology. Muscovites are able to cope with this task.

The comprehensive targeted programs for the accelerated development of all sectors of the economy and the social sphere should be a powerful mobilizing factor for bringing existing intensification reserves into play. Some 26 such programs have been developed in Moscow.

This is the right approach to solving long-term tasks. Without focusing efforts on the key questions it will be impossible today to achieve a breakthrough in production intensification or the acceleration of scientific and technical progress.

However, as is well known, there continue to be many difficulties at the junctions between sectors. Moreover, the development of industry, the city economy, transportation, construction, and the leisure sphere are always closely bound up with each other. That is why the Moscow Gorispolkom Planning Commission together with ministries and departments must think about whether or not to amalgamate these programs and link them to each other. This would make it possible to better coordinate the efforts of all participants irrespective of which department they come under. It would be expedient to involve the State Committee for Science and Technology and scientists from the Academy of Sciences in this work.

The effective development of integration ties with front-ranking enterprises in the CEMA countries and leading foreign firms is of considerable importance in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Moscow associations, enterprises, and organizations are still making very poor use of the rights accorded them in the sphere of foreign economic activity. The direct ties that have been established are primarily aimed at expanding reciprocal deliveries under production sharing agreements, rather than at deepening scientific and technical cooperation. This work must be sharply stepped up both by sector minitries and by our foreign economic departments.

The other day, as you know, a seminar of Moscow party raykom first secretaries was held. Together with a group of seminar participants we visited cultural and consumer projects in Gagarinskiy Rayon and met and chatted with people.

The conversations were sometimes very blunt. Muscovites cited a mass of examples of bureaucratism, callousness, mismanagement, and inattentiveness to their requirements and needs. Complaints were rightly made about the low quality of many types of consumer goods, and shortcomings in the work of municipal services.

I must state bluntly that most of the questions could have been successfully and effectively resolved by local organs of power. But the ingrained habit of avoiding this, sweeping problems under the rug, or redirecting them for examination by higher organs has not yet been overcome. One gets the impression that either leaders in the rayons have forgotten how to act independently or the resolution of all questions is too centralized.

Today all rights should be transferred to local level. Obviously, the party gorkom and the Moscow City Soviet together with rayon party and soviet organs must discuss and resolve these issues within a very short period. All the more so as there are already examples of really independent work.

In the same Gagarinskiy Rayon an economically accountable [khozraschetnyy] data processing center has been opened on the initiative of the party raykom, the rayispolkom, and the "Elektronika" Central Scientific Research Institute. It provides a number of new services for the population. These include leisure organization for children and teenagers with the use of computer games, the holding of various consultations in the sphere of data processing, and group and individual tuition in computing.

A similar center operates in the capital's Leninskiy Rayon with the help of the State Committee for Computer Technology and Information Science. What are other rayons waiting for?

Economic accountability [khozraschet] must literally penetrate all spheres of our life. We must be bolder in the creation of cooperatives, including cooperatives at enterprises, providing the most diverse services to the population. The necessary premises, materials, and tools must be provided for this.

We realize that the conditions for enterprises'transition to full economic accountability [khozraschet] cannot be identical for enterprises with differing levels of technical status. We must not fail to take this into account.

The state of affairs in the light, food, and processing sectors of industry is particularly worrying. They are the most backward in terms of equipment. Everything possible must be done to accelerate their modernization and retooling. This work must be constantly at the center of party committees' concern.

Moscow's working people expect us to take resolute measures to ensure a breakthrough in the provision of high-quality footwear, clothing, and other consumer goods, and to increase output of various foodstuffs. You and I must justify these hopes.

Under economic accountability [khozraschet] it is more important than ever to strictly observe delivery discipline and irreproachably fulfill contract commitments. It is not volumes in general but the absolutely specific products that the country and people need that are important. This is the whole ideology of the economic reform.

Summing up all that has been said, I would like to focus your attention on the following aspects.

The task of enhancing the competence of cadres and their mastery of new economic methods of leadership must be brought to the forefront. Each production and scientific collective must have its own programs for the economic training of working people closely linked with specific conditions. Sector scientific organizations, VUZ's, and institutes for improving qualifications must be more actively involved in economic universal education.

We have reached agreement with the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy on the work of a standing seminar for the Moscow party and economic aktiv. In short, Comrades, the task of ensuring that cadres gain a genuine grasp of economics must be the constant concern of party committees at all levels.

It is necessary to make it clear that unless we achieve a breakthrough in the economic activity of the primary elements of production there can be no serious expectations of success in work in the new conditions. Every enterprise, every scientific research institute, and every design bureau must formulate specific and extensive measures for the renewal of all aspects of production, from the raising of equipment and technology standards to questions of the collective's social development. Particular attention must be devoted to expanding the use of new progressive forms of labor organization and improving production standards.

Individual investigation by ministries and departments is needed as regards the situation at loss-making enterprises—and there are about 70 of them in the city's industry and construction industry. The introduction of full economic accountability [khozraschet] at these enterprises can only be discussed with considerable reservations. A start must be made by improving their financial position. There are also simply small and technically backward enterprises whose transition to full economic accountability [khozraschet] will need more thorough preparation in order not to discredit the ideas of self-financing.

In carrying out all the work of restructuring it is hard to overestimate the role of the mass media. Reports about Muscovites' work and concerns constantly feature in the newspapers and magazines and are permanently present in radio and TV broadcasts. But a clear direction must be visible behind this proliferation of material. In indicating shortcomings, we must always think of how to eradicate them, and, above all, how to reveal the reasons that give rise to shortcomings. We need good advice, prompting, and an analysis of the events and processes taking place. We must look to the opinion of party committees, deputies, the public, and labor collectives more often.

It is necessary to seek out virtually grain by grain and to widely disseminate everything front-ranking that is born during restructuring and in the conditions of the new economic mechanism's introduction. We do not need reporters of events, as some press publications turn out to be at times, but genuine organizers of the masses. Today this Leninist demand on the press is more topical than ever before.

I must reiterate again and again: We do not have nor should we have any no-go areas for criticism. The struggle for strong discipline and firm order, the encouragement of initiative and creative approaches, and the intolerance shown toward any manifestations of unscrupulousness at work, bureaucratism, irresponsibility, or mismanagement are meant to be the norm for the activity and behavior of all Soviet people and all Muscovites. This too must be a central theme for our press. Now the capital's party organizations are holding meetings of communists to hear reports by elected organs on their work in the leadership of restructuring. A serious and objective discussion is under way on the initial practical results. An exacting assessment is being made of real positive changes in the economic, social, and spiritual spheres. Shortcomings and omissions are coming to light, and plans are being outlined to augment our work and get restructuring going at full speed.

It is very important to ensure that all this work proceeds without unnecessary stage management, ostentation, and verbosity. The meeting participants must formulate specific measures for the successful fulfillment of set targets, the elimination of all bottlenecks, and the strengthening of laggard sections.

Our economy's efficiency, receptivity to advanced technology, ability to produce first-rate products, and stand up to any competition in world markets are now being tested. We are working to implement the targets of the 12th 5-Year Plan—a key plan in the acceleration program. It is necessary to ensure a qualitative improvement in the economy in a short period and create a firm foundation for the future. There are no ready-made prescriptions for all eventualities in life. We have to interpret the practice of renewal, to pick up and develop the experience of the best.

Being in the vanguard of restructuring means displaying endurance, not giving in to difficulties, and being able to recognize and cut short any actions by those who are deliberately applying the brakes to our work, failing to take measures to eliminate shortcomings, and at times simply reveling with malicious glee in the difficulties and failures.

This means learning to overcome lack of initiative and incompetence and struggling against administrative-command methods of management.

This means not yielding to the temptation to present wishful thinking as reality and to report imaginary successes at any cost.

Our conference must provide a good impetus to enhanced activity by all elements of the city's party organization.

In conclusion I think we ought to agree on the following. Gorkom departments will generalize all the proposals and observations made and will draft appropriate instructions. The Gorkom Bureau will examine and approve them. It is obvious that on some questions it will be necessary to look to central organs to provide help and make the necessary decisions.

Tremendous work lies ahead at the new and very complex stage of our society's development. We can and must act so that Moscow becomes the genuine leader of restructuring.

We are obligated to achieve this.

Scientific

New Space Crews Presented to Journalists

LD091847 Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—The space mission of Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov is drawing to an end. One of the crews, which was presented to journalists today by Major-General of Aviation Aleksey Leonov, deputy head of the Cosmonauts training center named after Yuriy Gagarin, will succeed them at the "Mir" orbital station.

The commander of the first crew is Colonel Vladimir Titov, pilot-cosmonaut of the USSR. The flight engineer is Musakhiy Manarov, a graduate of the Moscow Aviation Institute, and the cosmonaut-researcher is Anatoliy Levchenko, a merited test pilot of the USSR.

The commander of the second three-men crew is Colonel Aleksandr Volkov, pilot-cosmonaut of the USSR, the Hero of the Soviet Union, the flight-engineer is Aleksandr Kaleri, graduate of the Moscow Physics-Engineering institute, and the cosmonaut-researcher is Aleksandr Shchukin, first-class test pilot.

Tomorrow, the crews will fly to the Baykonur Cosmodrome where pre-launch preparations will get under way.

Lapshin Interviewed on Nuclear Safety

PM091307 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with A. Lapshin, USSR deputy minister of nuclear power generation, by special correspondent A. Ivakhnov: "The AES Today and Tomorrow; What Measures Are Being Taken in the USSR to Step Up Nuclear Power Safety"; date and place of interview not stated]

[Text] Before the Chernobyl disaster, we had little idea of the damage that could be caused to nature and people by radioactivity that had gotten out of control. Perhaps readers are right in believing that AES's should be constructed in remote, unpopulated regions?

We put this question to A. Lapshin, USSR deputy minister of nuclear power generation.

[Lapshin] I will not mention the fact that it is economically inconvenient. After all, it is a question of people's safety. But does construction of an AES not make that territory inhabited? A modern atomic power station is an enormous enterprise with a very big staff of employees. Add the construction workers, consumer services, medical services, and other elements of the infrastructure. At least 30,000 people live near an AES with a yield of 6 million kilowatts—that is a whole city.

The point is not where the station is situated. AES's must be safe in any region.

[Ivakhnov] Has the accident which occured led to any new approaches to the choice of sites for constructing AES's?

[Lapshin] It would be wrong to suppose that prior to the accident the USSR Ministry of Power Engineering attached no importance to questions of safety in choosing sites for constructing AES's. They were strictly guided here by state documents regulating these questions like the "General Provisions for Ensuring the Safety of AES's During Planning, Installation, and Operation," "Health Rules for Planning and Operating AES's," and many others.

These documents cover the requirements connected with an AES's potential impact on the environment and the radiation danger to the population. That includes factors like the station's remoteness from major cities, creation of protective zones and observation zones around the AES, and the use of land and water sources in these zones.

Another group of requirements regulates the possible impact of human activity—mainly industrial activity—on the station itself. For instance, an examination is made to ascertain whether a particular region contains establishments that constitute a fire hazard or enterprises where discharges of toxic substances into the atmosphere are possible.

A third group of requirements concerns the natural conditions that could affect the safety of the AES's operation. A station cannot be constructed if the seismicity, according to the scale used in our country, is in excess of force eight. Littoral regions, where there is a great danger of tsunami, and areas with soils with unfavorable properties, are forbidden.

These rules are now being made even tougher.

[Ivakhnov] The structures of the reactor rooms must strictly comply with the plans and meet the strictest construction norms and rules. Have these requirements been taken into account in elaborating measures to increase the safety of such crucial establishments?

[Lapshin] Unfortunately, construction defects at AES's are a far from rare phenomenon, particularly in carrying out covered [skrytyye] operations when defects cannot be seen behind the layers of facing, plaster, and putty. Quality control in the construction process is blatantly inadequate. We are pinning great hopes on state acceptance, which will soon also be introduced into construction. The USSR State Committee for Standards must be concerned to ensure that it comes first to our projects.

[Ivakhnov] Have any changes been made in structures of reactors? Can you give a guarantee that the possibility of new accidents has been completely ruled out as a result of these reconstructions?

[Lapshin] Equipment or human actions containing not even the slightest chance of error do not exist. It is impossible to make any technology absolutely safe. It is not a question of totally excluding all unpleasantnesses—we must minimize them and, most importantly, rule out accidents which would lead to discharge of radioactivity. Coping with this task is entirely within our powers.

After the incident at Chernobyl, specialists made an in-depth analysis of the situation at all the country's AES's without exception. The cream of our atomic science and technology took part in this work.

As soon as we learned of the accident, discipline was toughened at the stations, and any substandard regimes were banned. By selecting the necessary ratios between fuel, absorber, and moderator, the possibility of the reactor's uncontrolled runaway has been totally ruled out.

Special attention has been paid to the so-called "doubles" of the Chernobyl reactors: the so-called high-power, water-cooled, graphite-moderated boiling water reactors.

Since the early eighties, we have begun to erect special shells over reactors. Their structures are so solid that they withstand possible pressure from the mixture of water and steam discharged from a damaged reactor and even a modern supersonic aircraft falling on them. These shells are being installed over all AES's with water-cooled reactors now under construction. This type of reactor is widespread in the world. All commercial atomic power engineering in France, the FRG, and the United States is based mainly on it. Our energy program is also based on a water-cooled reactor with a yield of 1 million kilowatts.

Diagnostic systems, keeping track of the state not only of the station's units and equipment but also of the instruments monitoring their work, are being widely developed.

[Ivakhnov] What changes have there been in cadres policy since Chernobyl?

[Lapshin] The principles for selecting and training AES cadres were elaborated long ago, but with the rapid development of power engineering and the need to form ever new AES collectives, attention paid to these problems has indeed been inadequate.

A new system for training specialists has now been elaborated. It is pervaded with a single procedure from the training of students and post-institute study to constant retraining and rechecking of knowledge throughout the specialist's professional activity. This is done not only for AES operators but also for people of all professions working in nuclear power generation.

Unfortunately, the technical means for training AES specialists are still imperfect. Training equipment still does not operate rapidly enough: Computers have not yet been created in the country complying with all working conditions within the training equipment complexes. In connection with the introduction of the new economic mechanism, industry will evidently meet clients' requirements to a fuller extent. We hope by 1990 to have the most modern equipment at training centers. New centers of this kind are now being constructed at the Zaporozhye AES and developed for the Beloyarsk AES.

The creation at all AES of instruction and training points where operators and other workers will regularly check their readiness to meet extraordinary situations is close to completion.

[Ivakhnov] And one last question. At some time, the period of operation of each reactor will come to an end, and it will have to be stopped forever. What is its further fate? Another point: What are you doing with the radioactive waste which forms in the process of an AES's operation?

[Lapshin] Radioactive waste is put into special storehouses or burials. Dangerous substances are placed in capsules or drums and are covered with a sealant compound—bitumen, glass, or cement. The storehouse is a

concrete container lined with stainless steel and provided with reliable control systems. Special attention is paid to the storehouses' waterproofing: Leaking of radioactive elements into the environment is totally ruled out.

As for reactors that have outlived their usefulness, here we are at the stage of seeking a concept. The simplest path is to relieve the reactor of its fuel, lock the station up, and wait for scientists to work out what to do with it next. The most complex is to dismantle everything completely, to take it away, and to restore a little corner of primordial nature on the site. Between these two extremes we see a third path, which is obviously the most rational: All radioactive equipment and structures would be dismantled, detached, and dispatched to storehouses, and the remaining premises would be used for other technologies.

The final answer to your question will be given by an international collective, which is resolving this task within the framework of the comprehensive program for the CEMA countries' scientific and technical progress through the year 2000.